Copy D

The COMMUNIST

JUNE

THE LAFOLLETTE THIRD PARTY VENTURE

(REVIEW OF THE MONTH)

ALEX BITTELMAN

Mastering Bolshevik Methods of Work — EARL BROWDER

The Socialist Party Convention — WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

The People's Struggle Against Fascism in Brazil — MARINA LOPES

Bukharin—The Path of a Traitor — V. J. JEROME

Some Questions Concerning the Democratic Front — GENE DENNIS

The I.W.O.—Workers' Fraternalism — MAX BEDACHT

TWENTY CENTS

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Builders of the Democratic Front!

NEW PAMPHLETS TO READ AND DISTRIBUTE

CONCERTED ACTION OR ISOLATION: WHICH IS THE ROAD TO PEACE? by Earl Browder ..... .10
A brilliant exposition of the policy of collective security.

TRAITORS IN AMERICAN HISTORY, by Earl Browder ..... .05
The Moscow treason trials reflected in American history

FRANCE OF THE PEOPLE'S FRONT AND ITS MISSION IN THE WORLD, by Maurice Thorez ..... .20
The report of its General Secretary to the Convention of the Communist Party of France

WE ACCUSE: THE STORY OF TOM MOONEY, by Vito Marcantonio ..... .05
A stirring review of the most notorious frame-up in American labor history

UPTON SINCLAIR ON THE SOVIET UNION ..... .02
An open letter addressed to the Trotskyite Red-baiter Eugene Lyons

STOP WAGE-CUTS AND LAYOFFS ON THE RAILROADS, by William Z. Foster ..... .05
A reply to the slanders of Mr. Cashen, of the Switchmen's Union

STUDENTS UNDER ARMS, by Nancy Bedford-Jones ..... .05
Education in Republican Spain under war conditions

THE LAFOLLETTE THIRD PARTY: Will It Unite or Split the Progressive Forces ..... .02

LABOR CONDEMNS TROTSKYISM ..... .03
Resolution adopted by the Mexican Confederation of Labor

•

Order from your bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XVII, No. 6 JUNE, 1938

The COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM
PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.
EDITORS: EARL BROWDER, ALEX BITTELMAN, V. J. JEROME

CONTENTS

Review of the Month	A. B.	483
Mastering Bolshevik Methods of Work	EARL BROWDER	500
The Socialist Party Convention	WILLIAM Z. FOSTER	509
The People's Struggle Against Fascism in Brazil	MARINA LOPES	513
Bukharin—the Path of a Traitor	V. J. JEROME	526
Some Questions Concerning the Democratic Front	GENE DENNIS	534
The I.W.O.—Workers' Fraternalism	MAX BEDACHT	541
Monopolies, Prices and Profits	GEORGE BRAHMS	553
The Campaign for the Federal Arts Bill	C. S. MARIN	562
The World Communist Press		571

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Send checks, money orders and correspondence to THE COMMUNIST, *P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 E. 13th St.), New York. Subscription rates: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.*

PRINTED IN U.S.A. 309

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MARXIST BOOK-OF-THE-MONTH SELECTION

Extended for June

THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

By EARL BROWDER

In this tremendously important book, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the United States outlines the position of the Party on the most burning issues of the day, the C.I.O., the Supreme Court, the Farmer-Labor Party movement, the welfare of the new generation, the struggle for Negro rights, foreign policy, intervention in Spain, Japan's invasion of China, the building of socialism in the U.S.S.R., the recent trials of the Trotskyites and other traitors, the struggle for collective security, etc. The book reveals, in brilliant and forceful style, the programmatic advance of the People's Front in the United States, the role of the Party in giving it political form and direction, and the development of Party policy during the last critical period.

350 pages, $2.25

Order from your bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

Governor LaFollette's Venture. Reaction Is Happy, the Progressives Are Not. A Confused Liberal Sees "Leftward" Pressure. Communist Party Statement. On Scarcity and Spoon-Feeding. Double Meanings and Double Dealings. The Masses Make Themselves Heard. Parallel Labor Action on Relief and Recovery. A Significant Beginning. Devastations of Economic Crisis. A Comparison with 1929. Moods of the Masses and Their Reaction to the New Deal. No Return to Hooverism. Gains Achieved and Tasks Ahead. The Mechanics of Governor LaFollette's Program. Can Government Spending Stimulate Recovery? New Features in Crisis and New Features of Recovery. For the Program of Democratic Front. The Battle for Relief and Recovery in Coming Elections. Deliberations of Communist Convention. How to Resist Wage Cuts. Three Traps Set for Labor by Big Business. A Book by Georgi Dimitroff: "The United Front."

PRESS comments on Governor LaFollette's new political venture—"The National Progressives"—have on the whole shown a remarkable correspondence to the actual class alignments in the country. Spokesmen for monopoly reaction met the new venture with complete satisfaction, almost triumph. On the other hand, the opponents of monopoly reaction, those that have spoken, demonstrated deep distrust and suspicion of the whole thing—which is a healthy sign, a sign of growing political maturity.

Naturally, there are exceptions. There are also what might be called complicated cases. Thus we find in certain liberal circles a mixed attitude, one trying to combine mistrust with hope. It is as though one would say: well, the thing does not look so very good, yet perhaps something good may come out of it in the end. This latter attitude rests its hopes especially on the illusory and unrealistic consideration that Governor LaFollette's venture may somehow push President Roosevelt to the Left and may even force some of the reactionary Democrats to follow the President. A case in point is the *New Republic* which, on May 11, wrote as follows:

> "The existence of this new bid for power offers a healthy threat to the Democratic leaders and to Mr. Roosevelt himself. It is an embodiment of wholesome pressure for action *in a slightly Leftward direction*. . . . Governor LaFollette has made it necessary for the Democrats to keep going in order to remain in power. The time to apply such a spur was certainly at hand." (Our emphasis.—A.B.)

About the need for pressure, pressure by the people and its genuine progressive movements, we have spoken much and will do so again in a moment. But first let us see what kind of a "pressure" it is that Governor LaFollette is trying to exert. *Whose* spur is he wielding, the spur of the progressives or of the reactionaries? The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spokesmen of the reactionary monopolies themselves seem to have had little difficulty in answering this question promptly and to the point. Here is the *Journal of Commerce*, speaking for the pirates of Big Business:

"Governor LaFollette proposed nothing less than the termination of government relief for the unemployed, the abandonment of crop control, deflation of wages and prices and the withdrawal of the federal government from housing and other fields in which it has assumed so prominent a role in recent years. The National Progressives would do more than modify the New Deal, which the Republicans are ready to do. They would abolish it from the face of the earth."

A mighty strong class sense of smell these reactionaries have, haven't they? These Wall Street sharks see also quite clearly what Governor LaFollette is aiming at. He aims his blows at everything that the people stand for at the present time. He sends his blows in the same direction as the reactionaries do. Yet the *New Republic* finds it possible to speak of the governor's pressure upon the New Deal as being in "a slightly Leftward direction." This journal must have gotten its directions all mixed up.

Let us turn to another conservative evaluation of the governor's venture. It is Arthur Krock we are going to quote, the Washington correspondent of *The New York Times*. Asserting that "The gravity of industrial conditions makes self-restraint imperative upon the President," meaning by it the factors which tend to force the President to give in *to the reactionaries*, this rather intelligent political commentator says the following about the effect of the LaFollette pressure:

"Doubtless also the prod of the LaFollette meeting at Madison was felt. For, despite a loose impression that the dominant politicians of Wisconsin are wild radicals, their platform of Thursday night is almost pure Wilsonian, largely acceptable to the traditional Democrats [Al Smith, for example?—A. B.]. In style and context this platform made some of the New Deal acts and writings appear adolescent and faintly alien." (*The New York Times*, May 1.)

And editorially the same paper (April 30) has this to say:

". . . Governor LaFollette expressed certain ideas which must have seemed to many of his followers to have a strangely conservative ring."

Yes, and more than just a ring. Yet the *New Republic* sees here pressure in a "slightly Leftward direction." Astounding.

But perhaps the more outspoken and definitely reactionary *Herald Tribune* will be able to show the light to this slightly confused liberal commentator. All of a sudden, the *Herald Tribune* has discovered (right after the governor's Madison speech) that Wisconsin is a most marvelous state, "an oasis of industrial peace," and so it entitled an editorial on May 6. It writes:

". . . Wisconsin, throughout the turmoil of the last eighteen months, has remained, relatively speaking at least, an oasis of industrial peace. Why?"

Having discovered just this minute the miracle of Wisconsin, and having formulated this curious question, the *Herald Tribune* proceeds to suggest the answer:

"We like to think that the social and political philosophy which Governor LaFollette enunciated in his recent speech at Madison has had its effect."

Thus the whole business of Wisconsin, the "oasis," is merely an ex-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cuse for the reactionary *Herald Tribune* to give its blessings to the "social and political philosophy" of Governor LaFollette as incorporated in his Madison speech. Now, who is right in this matter, the *Herald Tribune* or the *New Republic*? We are inclined to believe that the reactionary *Herald Tribune* has a better sense of class smell and surely more realism than is displayed by the "slightly" confused editorial in the *New Republic*.

And wherein does its error lie? The Central Committee of the Communist Party has already made public its evaluation of the LaFollette venture (*Daily Worker*, May 11). A study of this document will answer the question fully. Here we can point out only this: the *New Republic* has failed to see and grasp the two things without which no correct understanding is possible. It is, first, the reactionary class interests which the governor's program serves objectively as distinct from some of its verbiage which is sometimes justly called demagogy. It is, secondly, the incontestable fact that the governor's venture tends to divide, confuse and weaken the progressive camp while giving comfort and strength to the reactionary camp. It is not for nothing that the entire camp of reaction, including its semi-fascist and fascist wings (Hearst, Coughlin) have seized upon the governor's venture as a new-found treasure.

We must not let ourselves be blinded and deceived by words and labels. The governor very cleverly appropriates (tries to) the progressive "third party" traditions; and in this he is helped by the fact that Wisconsin lies in the region from which such movements have sprung up in the past. He is helped additionally by the LaFollette "tradition" generally, although this is manysided. Most of all, he tries to help himself by using the real grievances of the masses of the people with existing conditions as arising from the developing crisis, from the offensive of finance capital and from the inadequacies of the policies of the Roosevelt administration. But see how he does it. He does *not* attack monopoly capitalism and the reactionary monopolies, the true culprits, those responsible for the crisis. No. He attacks the masses of the people for refusing to carry the burden of the crisis, for wanting to shift some of that burden to Big Business and to the rich, for demanding of the government help and assistance.

Of course, he tries to do it "cleverly" and this is precisely what makes it look so much like the standardized methods of fascism. He attacks "coddling and spoon-feeding." How shall that be understood? The politically inexperienced worker, farmer and middle class person may understand it one way. He may understand it as expressing his own protest against the crisis; his own resentment against being forced to live on relief, on *inadequate* relief, instead of working at at job and earning a decent income. But it is nothing of the sort. This attack on "coddling and spoon-feeding" has a *double* meaning. The reactionary monopolies and capitalist agrarians (not the farmer), these understand it as championing their cause, as lending aid to their own demand of no concessions to the people and a free hand to the monopolies and the exploiters of the people.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Or take the governor's attack on the scarcity policies of the New Deal and his demand for "more production and more work." How shall this be understood? Again the politically inexperienced worker, farmer and middle class person may be tempted to read into it their own deep yearnings for steady jobs, for a more abundant life, for a normal and regular income, for security. But this is not the meaning of it at all. This too has a double meaning. And to the vultures of Big Business this means abandonment of all governmental attempts to protect the people from the oppression of their exploiters. It means precisely what the Liberty League demanded, and the National Association of Manufacturers, and what the Chamber of Commerce has just restated in the resolutions of its last national gathering. It means: *Free rein for the monopolies and monopoly reaction.*

The whole program and speech of Governor LaFollette are shot through with such *double meanings.* Why should that be so? What honest progressive will resort to this kind of trickery? How can a genuine progressive resort to the fascist methods of double meaning and double dealing? For, at this late hour, it must be clear to every informed person that this method and this "style"—the method of clothing the nakedly brutal demands of the reactionary monopolies with the vague and unclear desires of the masses (not the clear demands of the progressive leaders of the masses)—this method bears a very close resemblance to those of Hitler and Mussolini.

It is precisely the method that seeks, on the one hand, to assure the reactionary monopolies and agrarian capitalists that their interests will be fully taken care of by putting into life their own program and, on the other hand, to catch the masses on the hook of their vague and unclear desires, to confuse and demoralize them, to inveigle them into supporting ventures for their own enslavement. Isn't this method, the method of fascism, familiar enough by this time?

The spokesmen of the reactionary monopolies have made no mistake when they showered so much approval and encouragement upon the Wisconsin governor. Equally, the camp of genuine progress has shown a healthy instinct in meeting this venture with such unmistakable distrust and suspicion. And this distrust will be increased, not weakened, by the subsequent attempt of *Senator* LaFollette to give a progressive interpretation to his brother's venture.

What did the Senator really say in his broadcast on May 9? From the incomplete press reports we gather that, while criticizing mildly the inadequacies of the New Deal policies, he devoted himself largely to showing that the Democratic Party cannot be used by the people as a vehicle or instrument for progress. He singled out for attack especially the reactionaries in the Democratic Party, blaming them for the situation which "threatens to destroy the effectiveness of one of the great liberal leaders of modern times—Franklin D. Roosevelt" (*The New York Post,* May 10). Which, on the whole, allowing for the diplomatically exaggerated praise for the President, is correct. But what conclusion does the Senator reach? Not the obvi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ous and necessary one. Not the conclusion that it is absolutely imperative *for all democratic forces,* regardless of party label and affiliation, to get together to make the people's will more effective and to break in this way the offensive of the bi-partisan reactionary coalition. This conclusion he does not make. But he calls upon the people to support the anti-progressive program of Governor LaFollette and his divisive and splitting venture. In other words, the Senator tries to sell to the progressive camp the governor's dangerous venture by putting on it a progressive interpretation.

The *New Republic* and like-minded will feel encouraged by the Senator's speech in their mistaken belief that the governor's venture will tend to push the administration to the Left, "slightly to the Left." As a matter of fact, it has already given aid and comfort to the reactionaries. In this way, its tendency is to push the administration to the Right. Or, to use an expression of Arthur Krock, it tends to exercise upon the administration a "restraining" influence. Moreover, in the states of the Midwest and Northwest, the immediate effect of the so-called "National Progressives" upon the farmer-labor movements will be definitely divisive and retrogressive, if not counteracted at once by a practical and flexible policy of a united democratic front against the offensive of reaction—the only way to the new party of the people.

* * *

AT LAST, after a long while of relative passivity in the face of the increasing offensive of finance capital in the developing crisis, the camp of progress and democracy has begun to come forward and to assert itself. It is now taking place before our very eyes in the struggle for the adoption of the President's relief and recovery proposals, in the fight for the Wages and Hours Bill, and for the Anti-Lynching Bill.

Most significant and promising in this fight thus far is the united support by the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. to the relief and recovery proposals and to the Wages and Hours Bill. Though each organization gave its support separately and independently, yet both directed their efforts towards the same end and against the common enemy. It may turn out to be a beginning—a very modest beginning—toward truly united action of labor. It is our duty to make it so.

Not only labor but the people generally began to speak out definitely in support of action in the developing crisis—action for the benefit of the masses and against the offensive of finance capital. Labor's united action had no doubt a good deal to do with it. Basically, of course, these fresh stirrings among the masses of the people, stirrings which presage the *maturing readiness for a new advance,* are the result of accumulating resentments against the offensive of the monopolies in the developing crisis as well as dissatisfaction with the inadequacies and slow motion of the administration's policies.

We must take serious account of the existing and growing uneasiness among the masses of the people with the course and development of the economic crisis. While realizing more or less clearly how much worse it was, economically and especially political-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ly, during the crisis years of 1929-32 under the Hoover regime; while determined not to go back to those days under any circumstances, particularly because a return to the Hoover days would mean not just a restoration of what has been but a restoration in the form of *most intense reaction and beginnings of fascism;* while realizing all this more or less clearly, the masses of the people are visibly growing impatient and dissatisfied with conditions. Why? It is extremely important to find the correct answer to this question.

To begin with, it is the course of the crisis and the offensive of finance capital. For the working class, this has already meant an increase in the army of unemployed to about 15,000,000. It has meant a tremendous drop in earnings for the employed, as well as increased speed-up, daily fear of losing the job, direct and indirect wage-cuts in many industries, new threats of more sweeping wage-cuts, and a growing provocative attitude of the employers towards the trade unions engineered by the National Association of Manufacturers and by the Chamber of Commerce (the campaign against the Wagner Act).

For the mass of the farmers, the developing crisis has already meant a terrific drop in income and growing indebtedness. Among the small and tenant farmers, and particularly the sharecroppers, the situation in some spots may be approaching the catastrophic.

And as to the middle classes, the picture is more chekered. But on the whole, the developing crisis and the offensive of the monopolies are undermining their condition also.

In all this, one might say, there is nothing unexpected. This is what economic crises, inevitable under capitalism, are bound to do. Especially a cyclical crisis which came before the previous recovery could reach the phase of boom, a cyclical crisis which broke so soon after the most devastating crisis years of 1929-32 under the regime of Hoover. Between these two crises, the people had almost no breathing spell, no serious chance to recover from the effects of the old before they had the new crisis break upon them. It is, as we said, the *surroundings* in which this crisis broke, the general crisis of the capitalist system (the dying of capitalism) and the world offensive of fascism and the offensive of finance capital here, it is all this which makes the present cyclical economic crisis what it is, *that makes its burdens for the people harder to carry in many respects than was the case in 1929-32.*

One might and should say all that; but it is not enough. Feeling as they do the extra difficulties of carrying the burden of the present crisis, the masses also feel, and many of them understand, *that it is more possible today than it was in 1929 to make the monopolies and the rich carry the burden of the crisis. That is why the masses demand more today. That is why they are willing to fight for more.*

And this is the important, the central point, we are seeking to make. The masses of the people find it harder to carry the burdens of this crisis, harder than in 1929-32, not only because this one came so soon after the previous one, not only because there was so little breathing spell between the two, but also because they

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

see that much of their present sufferings is *needless,* that much of it could be *avoided,* that much could be done, much more than is being done, to make their lives easier, *and incomparably more than what the people dreamed of doing in 1929-32.*

The last point is especially important for a correct evaluation of the present moods of the masses and where it all comes from. In 1929-32, we had no federal unemployment relief. To demand such a thing was almost revolutionary. Unemployed workers were clubbed, gassed, shot at and otherwise maltreated for merely coming out on the streets and demanding it. In 1929-32, we had nothing by way of unemployment insurance. Only the masses following the Communists were demanding it. Even the A. F. of L. was opposed to it. In 1929-32, nothing was done to help the farmers: they were left to starve, go bankrupt, lose their land and go ruined.

The middle classes were given the privilege of going through the "wringer" held by the monopolies and the big banks—and take the consequences in the best style of "free" competition under monopoly capitalism. Small homeowners were losing their dearly bought homes in the tens of thousands. Small bank depositors in the millions saw their slim fortunes disappear into nothing or, rather, into something which made the big capitalists richer and more powerful. All this we had in 1929-32, under the regime of Hoover, the regime under which the reactionary monopolies had all the "freedom" they are now sabotaging for.

Then things began to happen. The masses were waking up. Larger and larger numbers, in the cities and in the farms, were entering the fight, *initiated by the Communists,* to shift the burden of the crisis to the monopolies and the rich. It was a long and instructive story. But the short of it was the rise of the people against the offensive of reaction and incipient fascism, the emergence of the working class as a basic political factor in this fight, and a clearly defined movement of many forces of the people towards a common front against the reactionary and fascist-minded monopolies. Milestones in this process were the coming forward of the C.I.O., the defeat of Landon in 1936, the first steps of collaboration of labor and the farmers, to mention only the most significant ones.

All this meant something very big for the growing self-confidence of the masses of the people, for their ability to fight for and obtain improvements, and for the scope of their demands. The masses wouldn't think now of putting up with things which they suffered in 1929-32. *They feel they are entitled to more. They feel they can obtain more.*

Now, therefore, when the masses of our people see the President's relief and recovery proposals submitted to Congress almost a year after the beginning of the crisis, their reaction is *manifold.* They are acutely conscious of the fact that they have before them *a gain,* an achievement, a conquest obtained by a long and bitter struggle against the reactionary monopolies and their political hangers-on. It is the achievement that the federal government has assumed responsibility for relief. They feel it is their own conquest *which they will not surren-*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

der to anyone, under any circumstances, unless it be for a system where people have security of job and income—socialism—and don't need unemployment relief. This is one side of the way the people feel about it. Another side is just as acute a feeling of the *inadequacy* of these proposals, of the *slowness* with which they came (a year after the crisis) and, above all, a knowledge that *much more* can and must be done in order really to shift the burden of the crisis from the backs of the people to the monopolies and rich. Here we find also the realization that *the people have a right to demand adequate measures.* What is still lacking is a sufficient realization that the people have equally *a duty to fight for such measures.* And the third side of the way in which the masses react to the President's relief and recovery proposals is a rather vague realization that these are only hand to mouth measures, good for the moment to alleviate suffering somewhat, but that they do not seem to reach to the bottom of things and offer no lasting and fundamental solution to the problems of security, jobs, democracy and peace.

Similar and manifold is the reaction of the people to most of the other New Deal measures, for example, the agrarian legislation. When the farmers received that legislation all of them undoubtedly felt that it was their gain, the result of their struggles against the brutality and indifference of the Hoover regime when the monopolies and big banks were running wild plundering the farmers without any check. *This gain the farmers will not surrender.* They have brought the federal government to assume certain obligations for the fate of the agricultural masses, and to this the farmers will hold on, no matter what happens.

Yet they also can't help feeling (especially the small farmers, tenants and sharecroppers) that the existing agrarian legislation favors the rich farmer, often at the expense of the small one; that the relief is inadequate; and that the set-up which administers the legislation is not democratic enough, often becoming the servant of the big against the small farmer. We can assume that at least one-half, if not a majority, feel this way about the matter. And, lastly, the farmers are definitely uneasy and worried about a condition where agriculture has been in continuing crisis for almost twenty years, that the end is not in sight, that there seems to be no outlook for the coming of "normal" conditions back to American agriculture.

These moods and attitudes of the masses of the people, we must try to understand fully, if we are to be more helpful in hastening the coming together of the democratic forces into one common front for a more successful fight to realize the people's demands and to satisfy their needs. We must try to understand these moods also for another reason, a reason made more urgent by the coming back to intense activity of such pro-fascist elements as Father Coughlin and by the anti-progressive and potentially dangerous venture of Governor LaFollette.

What, for example, is the *key* to the governor's program in this connection? The statement of the Cen-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tral Committee of the Communist Party in reply to the governor makes that clear.

The program itself—in spirit, content, and trend—is very definitely modeled after the programs of the monopolies and agrarian capitalists. But that is not all there is to it. It is so phrased and built as to make it look like the program of the people, like a progressive program. And this is what Senator LaFollette says it is. To see even more clearly that it isn't, look for a moment into the mechanics of the thing, remembering always that the *basic considerations are the reactionary class interests* expressed in the program and the reactionary class *alignment* which it tends to strengthen. But—back to the mechanics of it.

It will be noted that the governor tries to make full use (in his Madison speech) of one side of the people's reaction to the New Deal measures, the feeling of the masses that these measures offer no lasting cure to our ills and open up no perspectives for their final solution and for the establishment of "normal" conditions. This side of the people's reactions, the governor exploits to the full—concentrates on—without, however, himself offering any definite proposals for permanent solution. He says that will come later.

Another side of the people's reaction to the New Deal measures, the feeling of the masses that these are inadequate and are slow in coming to realization, the governor exploits partly. He does not analyze the New Deal at all. Nor does he speak of its inadequacies the way the masses correctly feel about it. He just speaks of "spoon-feeding," leaving it to the masses to infer that he meant the insufficiency and inadequacy of relief, while making quite clear to the monopolies and agrarian-capitalists that he stands with them in opposition to all relief. This is the double meaning which we discussed in the foregoing.

And the third side of the people's attitude to the New Deal measures, namely, their feeling that this is *their gain and the result of their struggles against Hooverism and incipient fascism, their determination not to surrender these gains but to move on from them to larger gains and more lasting ones*—this side of the people's attitude the governor tries *not to deal with at all.* Moreover, he seeks very definitely to make the people forget about these gains and about the nature of the struggle—the developing democratic front—which obtained these gains.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party characterized the governor's program as offering *nothing for today—empty promises for tomorrow.* By examining the governor's mechanics we can find how this is intended to work. Make the people forget their immediate needs and the practical, though partial, demands immediately to satisfy these needs. Make the people forget that by following, on the whole, the road to the common democratic front, they have been able to fight reaction effectively and to achieve certain gains, material and political, from which it is now possible to march forward to greater conquests. And, lastly, make the people think of tomorrow, of the future, but in a vague and misty sort of way, without seeing clearly the road to the future, *without engaging in those struggles of today* which alone can

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bring us to the future of permanent and lasting security, abundance and happiness.

This program and these mechanics do not work for the people and their progress. They work the opposite way. And this we must show clearly to the workers, farmers and middle classes. As outlined in the resolutions before the Tenth National Convention of the Communist Party, which is being held in New York City, May 26-31, the fight against the offensive of finance capital in the developing crisis demands the consolidation of all progressive forces into a single democratic front—*not further disunity, but greater unity*—on a program that will meet the immediate needs of our people, on a program that can unite the majority of our people at the present time, on a program, therefore, that can be realized within the framework of capitalist society, with the chief aim of *blocking the road to fascism.*

To accomplish this aim, it is necessary that the masses be made constantly conscious of the exact nature and aims of their daily struggles: the rise of the forces of the democratic front, the course of the daily fight against reaction, the gains and setbacks, the next steps and perspectives. It is necessary further to examine systematically and continually the inadequacies of the Administration's measures, its inconsistencies and hesitations, advocating a determined and consistent realization of the program supported by the forces of the democratic front, and, above all, make the masses and their progressive organizations more conscious of their duty *to fight determinedly for the realization of their demands,* strengthening the organizations of the masses and working tirelessly for the consolidation of the common democratic front.

In doing so, we must never forget to point out that this and this alone is the road to the permanent and lasting solution of our problems and that that solution can be found and will be found only in socialism, as demonstrated daily by the historic achievements of the Soviet Union.

* * *

INSTEAD of hiding behind the reactionary Democrats, as they have been doing for quite a while, the Republicans have at last picked up sufficient courage to sail forth under their own party banner. Following a Republican conference (May 9), the minority leader of the House, Representative Snell, issued a statement on the bill incorporating the President's relief proposals which starts out like this:

> "The people of the United States are deceived that this bill is a measure seriously calculated to stimulate business recovery. It is only another New Deal political raid upon the treasury of the United States."

Well, Mr. Snell should know something about political raids upon the treasury of the United States since his party has had plenty of experience with this kind of thing. Surely, Teapot Dome under Harding, with Hoover in the cabinet, was an outstanding piece of work along these lines. The people ought to be reminded of that in more detail.

Leaving this angle aside for the moment, supposing the relief and recovery bill, which the Republicans oppose, is not "seriously calculated to stimulate business recovery" as

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

charged by Mr. Snell. Supposing further that, whether so calculated or not, the measure couldn't seriously promote recovery because it is too inadequate for that purpose. It is too inadequate for the purposes of relief alone. Supposing all this to be so, *what of it?* Should the unemployed, the farmers, and all who suffer on account of the crisis, be abandoned and let go hang, as in the days of Hoover? This is, of course, what the Republicans and the reactionary Democrats want without daring to say so. But their game is very obvious, too obvious, in fact.

Now, what about stimulating recovery? Can government spending (say, really large spending) do much in the present phase of the crisis to stimulate recovery along what is called "normal" lines? The spokesmen of the monopolies who themselves bear responsibility for the crisis, deny that categorically. They claim that the government can do nothing to stimulate recovery of private capitalist enterprise *except* by giving the monopolies "a free hand." And they claim further that without normal recovery in private enterprise there can be no recovery generally

In all these claims of the monopolies, we find a mixture of outright falsity and half-truths which is altogether deceiving. *The New York Times,* for example, writes a long and learned editorial (May 9) trying to prove that "pump-priming" has already failed (because the exchanges have not at once responded to it with much enthusiasm) and that, in general, government spending can be no factor in bringing about recovery.

To get at the real truth of it, it is necessary to remember first, that for all cyclical crises of capitalism, *somebody always had to pay;* and secondly, that the crisis itself and the process of transition from the lowest point of the crisis to the depression phase (the leveling out of the decline) and from that to recovery consisted *always* in the most brutal and reckless destruction of labor power, liquidation of weaker capitalist enterprises and concentration of capital, and terrific "deflation" of the agricultural masses.

This is how capitalism "normally" outlives a cyclical economic crisis. Yet even in the old days, prior to the beginning of the general crisis of capitalism as a world system, this "normal" process, to which the monopolies are looking so longingly, did *not* take place *automatically.* Big Business always tried to make sure, *by control of government and by forcible exercise of government power,* that the liquidation of the crisis should take place in strict accordance with "economic law and precedence." That is, *that the masses of the people (workers, farmers, middle classes) shall pay for the crisis.* Big Business *government* and Big Business governmental policies played a great part in helping the process of outliving the crisis along "normal" lines. Even if the government did nothing else but crush strikes against wage cuts imposed by capitalists to "help" outlive the crisis, disperse demonstrations of unemployed who demanded jobs or relief, suppress farmers who refused to let their belongings be auctioned off for the benefit of the big banks, terrorize and demoralize the small businessmen who cried for help against being driven to bankruptcy and ruin—even if the government did *nothing else but this*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(remember Hoover?), it was engaging in *spending,* it was actively *interfering* in the course of the crisis.

But Big Business governments did more, much more than that. Especially in the cyclical crises which took place since the beginning of the general crisis of the capitalist system. And what was it that they did and are doing? Recall the big crises of 1921 and 1929. Big Business government, not only in the United States but in all capitalist countries, especially so in the United States, *actually robbed the treasury* to subsidize and "lend" tremendous sums of money *to Big Business,* to help maintain their solvency, letting small business go hang and *suppressing* the workers and farmers.

Just remember Harding, Coolidge and Hoover and you have the "clasical" example of Big Business government policy during a crisis.

We see therefore that it is not government "interference" that Big Business objects to. Nor is it government "spending." It is government interference *in favor of the people* (very mildly in favor) and against the monopolies having a completely free hand. It is government spending to relieve somewhat the sufferings of the people during the crisis and to make the monopolies carry part (a very small part) of the burden. This is what the monopolies object to. And this is what Representative Snell is expressing.

In other words, we deal here with the struggle of the masses of the people—against their exploiters as it develops during an economic crisis, taking on new and special characteristics in the cyclical crises which have taken place since the beginning of the general crisis of the capitalist system. The people's exploiters, the monopolies, seek to make the masses carry the burden of the crisis while the people fight to shift the burden of the crisis to the monopolies. When the power of government is completely subservient to Big Business, governmental policy helps to outlive the crisis *at the expense of the people,* as in 1929-32, for example. When, however, the masses of the people (workers, farmers and middle classes) have become more conscious of their need and power, better organized, beginning to pull together, as today, in a common democratic front, government policies in the crisis are forced to tend in a different direction—in the *direction* of helping to outlive the crisis *at the expense of the monopolies and rich.*

In this latter case, the course of the crisis and its transition through depression to recovery (special kinds of recoveries, not the "normal type") is made less painful for the masses, less devastating for the people. It also creates conditions for the working class and its allies to become stronger *politically,* for the general fight against the offensive of finance capital and fascism.

Keeping all this clearly in mind, we shall be in a better position to answer correctly the question whether government spending can stimulate recovery. *It certainly can.* Only it has to be made very clear that this can be achieved to the benefit of the people *only by certain kinds of spending and through certain kinds of political policies.* It requires the application, the determined and consistent application, of the *full program of the democratic front.* We refer here to the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

program as stated in the draft resolutions to the Tenth National Convention of the Communist Party which embodies the present-day demands of the majority of our people.

The passage by the House of the President's relief and recovery proposals—made possible by the combined demands of the people—is a beginning in the right direction. The people's fight must be intensified to make sure that the measure does not get stuck in the Senate. This is the immediate task of the day.

From this achievement, the people will have to move to further actions. For it is clear that the relief and recovery measure now before the Senate is very inadequate even for purposes of relief. And as to stimulating recovery, this measure can hardly have much effect at the present time. The proposed spending is insufficient and spending alone will not do the job. Wages must be protected and improved, and working conditions generally. The Wages and Hours Bill must be passed, and the Anti-Lynching Bill.

The tremendous available wealth of the nation must be utilized to provide work or adequate relief for all jobless. This means promoting on the widest possible scale all sorts of socially desirable projects. It means improving the Social Security Act, democratizing the agrarian legislation and its administration ("the cost of production" principle must be introduced), extending the National Youth Administration to cover all needs of the youth. It means a debt moratorium and mortgage refinancing for the farmers. It means a taxation structure fully based upon ability to pay, especially by sharp increases in the higher brackets. Above all, the strike of Big Capital must be broken and the power of the monopolies in the economy and government of the country must be limited.

This requires, in the first instance, the defense and extension of the democratic rights of the people. It requires also a systematic struggle for peace, a policy of concerted action by the United States with the democratic peoples and governments of the world to halt and isolate the fascist aggressors, to assist their victims and thus to guarantee world peace.

It is impossible to talk seriously—let alone actually do it—of stimulating recovery only by means of a certain amount of inadequate spending, big and important as that is, without realizing consistently this complete program. *We must break the strike and opposition of big capital.* To see how important that is, just consider the full meaning of monopoly domination and sabotage as an obstacle to recovery. We quote from President Roosevelt's message to Congress:

> "Of all corporations reporting from every part of the nation, one-tenth of 1 per cent of them owned 52 per cent of the assets of all of them. Of all corporations reporting, less than 5 per cent of them owned 87 per cent of all the assets of all of them."

Here is a sample of concentration of ownership and control, a concentration which extends to this handful of finance capitalists the power of domination of vast fields of the nation's economy and economic life. When this handful is on strike against the people it inevitably will—as it does—obstruct the whole course of our lives.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And here is a sample of concentration of income:

"Of all the corporations reporting from every part of the country, one-tenth of 1 per cent of them earned 50 per cent of the net income of all of them. And to clinch the point: of all the manufacturing corporations reporting, less than 4 per cent of them earned 84 per cent of all the net profits of all of them."

It is this group of finance capitalists that is now carrying on the offensive upon the American people, destroying standards of living, worsening insecurity, whipping up political reaction, and promoting fascism and war. From this it can be seen that the problem of outliving the crisis with the least possible pain and suffering for the masses of the people and the problem of stimulating recovery is the problem of *an all sided* fight against the offensive of finance capital. It is a fight which only a common democratic front of the majority of our people—a bloc of workers, farmers and middle classes—can successfully carry on for the realization of the program of the people—the program of the democratic front.

The already developing struggle for the elections this fall marks therefore the opening of a crucial battle for relief and recovery in the interests of the people. The struggle between progress and reaction, between democracy and fascism, between peace and war.

It is the great historic fight which we, Communists, conceive of as a fight for the further development of democracy, a development to the very end; in which new forms of democracy will be found by the people and tested in practice; in which important economic measures will be realized for the security and well-being of the masses (for recovery, though new kinds of recovery) thus promoting the extension of democracy; in which the extension of democracy will help improve our economic life and standards; in which finally the American people will be moving in the direction of a fundamental and lasting solution of their problems—for democracy, security, jobs and peace—in the direction of the socialist reorganization of society.

The Tenth National Convention of the Communist Party, to be held May 26-31, in New York City, will prove a milestone in this great fight.

* * *

SPEAKING before the national convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, one of the most important and fruitful recent gatherings of organized labor, at which gathering very significant contributions were made for the further progress of the camp of labor and democracy, notably by Sidney Hillman, Murray and others—speaking before this gathering on May 12, John L. Lewis said:

". . . no general policy of wage reductions (can take place) without seriously imperiling every major interest of the land. . . . Labor must and will resist wage reductions—rather than taking cuts, labor will ask for wage increases."

The question of wage-cuts is becoming an acute question. Indirect wage cuts, through speed-up, etc., have been taking place in most industries. Direct wage cuts are being forced upon the workers in many industries, notably in shoes and textile.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The threat of more widespread cuts in the basic industries—rubber and railroad—is hanging now over our heads and the menace of similar threats in all major industries is an acute reality.

It is absolutely true that wage-cuts, as Lewis said, are seriously imperiling every major interest of our people. *Wage-cuts must be resisted* by strengthening and utilizing fully the economic and political power of labor, by promoting the unity of labor and by concentrating on the building of the democratic front.

Here it is necessary to throw some light on the maneuvers of Big Business in the "labor relations." As it came to expression at the last national convention of the Chambers of Commerce, there seem to exist among the sharks of Wall Street several "schools of thought" on the question. In passing, we wish to remark that, to the extent to which there is some tangible division and perhaps friction between various groups of Big Business on the question of wages and labor relations generally, *labor will be wise to make full use of these differences in the camp of the enemy to promote the fortunes of the workers and of the people generally.*

But in order to do so, labor will have to watch its step not to fall into a trap or traps. And of such traps, it is possible to discern several, though they may be skillfully camouflaged. One is the effort of Big Business to separate labor from its natural allies, from the farmers and middle classes, on such issues as monopoly prices. Big Business, or one section of it, may be willing to "promise" no wage-cuts provided monopoly prices are left untouched but such promises will prove to be only a maneuver designed to separate labor from the farmers and middle classes; and when this is accomplished Big Business as a whole will proceed to try to decimate each of these groups separately.

Another trap is the very visible maneuver of Big Business, expressed clearly at the Chambers of Commerce national gathering, consisting in one group of Big Business flirting with the A. F. of L. while another section of Big Business tries to flirt with the C.I.O. for the purpose of intensifying labor's disunity, of placing new obstacles in the way of unity. And if this trick should work out (and some reactionaries in the A. F. of L. seem inclined to go along with it), Big Business as a whole will feel free to enforce its broad wage-cutting program of which they make no secret, and to try to speed up the reactionary drive against the Labor Relations Act and against all unions, concentrating of course against the C.I.O.

Finally, there is the trap, perhaps not so visible now but real none the less, that Big Business, or a section of it functioning as a spearhead in the drive, *will try to initiate widespread wage-cuts, resorting to nation-wide lock-outs against workers who resist wage-cuts and refuse to accept them, removing plant equipment and production to "open shop" localities, bringing into play "vigilantes" and "citizen" committees, seeking to create antagonisms between labor and the farmers and middle classes, all of this timed in such a way with respect to elections this fall as to confuse the real issues, break up the camp of de-*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mocracy and assist reaction in the present offensive of finance capital both on the economic and political fields.

These are no ghosts or imaginary dangers but very real ones. Against all of these traps, labor must guard vigilantly because they are all part of one grand strategy of Big Business reaction. And the way to do it, while making full use of the frictions and divisions in the camp of the enemy, is to work in the coming weeks and months more tirelessly than ever before for working class unity, for resistance to wage cuts and for wage increases, for the more rapid promotion of the united action of all progressive forces in a single democratic front, for the united action of such a front in the coming elections.

It should be emphasized at this point that this demands utmost resistance to the divisive and anti-progressive venture of Governor LaFollette as well as the constant exposure of the machinations of the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites who are trying to fish in all troubled waters for the benefit of their fascist masters. It goes without saying that we must explain fully that Norman Thomas' encouragement to Phil LaFollette aids reaction and that the semi-Trotskyite "policies" adopted by the last national convention of the Socialist Party (if it can still be called by that name) work in the same direction.

* * *

ON MAY 8, Georgi Dimitroff, General Secretary of the Communist International, made public a message to the workers and peoples of all countries which is of extraordinary importance and significance to the struggle against fascism and war. It is called: *The Guaranty of Victory*, and he shows the *way* to victory (*Daily Worker*, May 9).

He starts out by what is troubling the minds of the people everywhere:

"The events now taking place in the capitalist world are causing natural and justifiable alarm among the entire international working class, among all working people, among all honest supporters of liberty and peace."

And what is it especially that causes this alarm?

"Before the eyes of the whole world the fascist brigands are insolently carrying out their plans of conquest, thrusting mankind into a new world imperialist slaughter."

In this, fascism is aided by the British Tories, by our own "isolationists," by every reactionary and pro-fascist group in all capitalist countries, especially in England, France and in the United States. And although the hold of isolationism upon the masses of our people is steadily breaking up, there is still a good deal of work to be done to help the people carry on an effective struggle for the policy of concerted peace action, the sort of work which Comrade Browder carried on, for example, in the debate with the isolationist, Libby, at Madison Square Garden, New York City, on May 4, attended by nearly 18,000 people.

The advance of the fascist brigands is, however, only one side of the world picture. The other side is this:

". . . Forces exist in the world which are capable of preventing this [the fascist plans of bloody conquest] and are in a position to break the back of fascism once and for all.

"The working class—the master of the fate

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of millions—has not yet said its final word. Nor have the peoples who desire neither fascism nor war."

Comrade Dimitroff lists four requirements for "breaking the back of fascism once and for all."

They are:

1. The fascist aggressors must be isolated internationally;

2. A consistent peace policy must be put into effect by all the states interested in the maintenance of peace;

3. United action by the international proletariat which makes it necessary "to break the resistance to this unity on the part of the reactionary leaders of the Socialist International and the International Federation of Trade Unions" (like the Citrines and Matthew Wolls, we might add); and

4 Developing the slogan raised by Stalin, Comrade Dimitroff calls for "a firm indissoluble alliance . . . between a united international working class and the great Soviet people."

He says: "United with the working class of the Land of the Soviets, the working class of the capitalist countries is invincible," and so is the cause of peace and democracy.

Which brings us to the great occasion of the appearance of a book by Georgi Dimitroff: *The United Front.* It was long awaited and at last it is here. It discusses, with the authority, insight and the moving power of inspiration that Comrade Dimitroff can give it, the problems of working class unity and the People's Front in the struggle against fascism and war. It is a guide to what millions in our country are striving and fighting for.

The book takes in the speeches and writings of the General Secretary of the Communist International for over three years. It starts with the unforgettable report to the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International and proceeds to enlighten and guide us through all the important phases of the fight against fascism since then. There is Spain, Italy, Germany, China. There is the Soviet Union. There is the whole world. And a whole world to learn from this book.

We all owe a great debt of gratitude to Comrade Dimitroff, the man who sounded at the Leipzig trial the clarion call for the united struggle against fascist barbarism. And we are happy to see his writings and speeches gathered into a book and thus made more easily available for daily reference, for study, for action.

A. B.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MASTERING BOLSHEVIK METHODS OF WORK*

BY EARL BROWDER

THE characteristic features of a Communist school are: to give the students an opportunity for more thorough knowledge and to prepare them for achieving even greater knowledge—all directed toward the task of mastering Bolshevism. The school, as Comrade Stalin has said many times, is only the preparatory stage: it must teach first of all—and I hope it has taught that to you—that you have not yet completely mastered Bolshevism after you have taken some of the first and most important steps to achieve that goal. Knowledge gained from books and schools is of the utmost significance; but it becomes a really important and serious fighting weapon only to the degree that you take the knowledge you have gained in school and make use of it out in the wide world, in the practical, every-day struggles of the people. Only to the degree that the ideas you are mastering in your studies become instruments for organizing and leading the great masses of the people —only to that degree has the school performed any serious function. And, it is outside the school, where you will not have the conditions of life very carefully regulated for you, that the real test will come.

I was particularly interested to see how the school deals with the characterizations of the work of the individual comrades, and I am quite sure that this is one of the most important features of what you have learned here. I want to emphasize, however, that I don't think the characterizations that have been given are the last word or that they are correct in all details. But, when I see a group of serious comrades engaged in a common task, who have learned this fundamental prerequisite, to begin to formulate collective judgments based upon a very dispassionate and objective examination, as dispassionate and objective as we are able to make it, of the work of the particular comrades engaged in it, I know that however many mistakes there may be in the detailed judgments, the whole trend of such a collective evaluation is good and healthy. Out of it will come constantly greater precision and judgment—an increasing degree of objectivity and the dispassionate weighing of values.

One of the difficulties in welding together a Party organization as an efficient and powerful machine is to solve

* Address to the National Training School of the Communist Party, April 28, 1938.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and overcome the problem of varying personalities, and to create the conditions for collective work. A recurrent obstacle in the way of achieving that is subjectivity—the individual feeling that he, the subject, is the beginning, the starting point, for his judgments; and that his particular problems and personality are the important thing to have under consideration. With such an approach we always exaggerate our own individual roles; and that is the greatest danger to our work. Sometimes, we exaggerate our own role by an inflated estimate of the positive contributions we make; at others, when we come to grief along that path, we retreat into an exaggerated self-criticism, which performs the same subjective function, by making us seem just as important in our negative features as we thought we were before in our positive contributions. What we want is the ability to face the questions that involve each one of us in our personal work, and to judge our own work with the same standards and the same precision that we would apply and want applied to everybody else. We must avoid or overcome the subjective approach, the feeling of sensitiveness in regard to critical examination.

In this respect, let me say a word about one of the contributions to our school work along this line, which has, in my opinion, been outstanding. We have had some very hard-working, loyal, well-equipped comrades helping you in your school. For several years now, I have been watching the development of our school work, and I don't think that it is too early to pass a certain judgment which I want to express here, about which I haven't spoken for a long time, because I wanted to be absolutely sure that it really represented such an obvious truth that everybody would have to agree with it right away. It seems to me that the development of this self-critical estimation of all our work in our schools has been established largely by Comrade Mindel and is one of the most valuable contributions that has been made to the methods of work of our Party. I don't say that this is Comrade Mindel's invention; but it is Comrade Mindel's particular contribution that he showed us this vital aspect of Bolshevism better than anyone else who has been engaged in this type of work, and we should thank him for it. I think that those who have smarted most under Comrade Mindel's application of this principle are the very ones who will most heartily join me in my words of commendation.

COLLECTIVE WORK AND INDIVIDUAL INITIATIVE

Now, you are going out from the school back into a big, broad world. The question is: Has the school really equipped you for the problems you are going to face? I don't have to tell you that this world is a tough, hard place, and is getting tougher every day. You are not going into any paradise. As you all know, it is not going to be easy; and you are not going to find your problems solved for you so easily as they have been solved in this school. The problems are becoming ever more complicated, and if the people are to be successful in their struggle, a higher type of leadership will be required. As you know from your experiences in mass work, you

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are going to have to pass some examinations in the world of practical work much more severe than you ever imagined here in the school. Each and every one of you will be put to the test.

What are the essentials that you should have equipped yourself with from this school to help you pass these tests more successfully? I would say two things above all: You must first have learned the absolute necessity of adapting yourselves as leading Party comrades to organized collective work, the multiplication of our powers by combined collective work. Of course, this is not something you learn all at once. To grasp the fundamental importance of this necessity, you will have to go much deeper into the problem of the development of the collective work of the Party and its leading institutions—collectivity which must reach ever-higher stages of development. At the same time, you must learn the second most important condition for successful work: You must learn to stand on your own feet and be able to solve problems even if you are standing absolutely alone. There is no contradiction between these two aspects of Bolshevik work. They are the two opposites which are the prerequisites for the unity of collective leadership. The supremacy of collective work does not at all mean the negation of the role of the individual. When you begin to achieve real collective work, only then will you see the real, whole development of the individual and the positive contribution that every individual makes; in this way every individual will be tested—not alone by his words, but by his contact with the masses in their daily struggles, by his contribution in formulating the Party's policies and his ability to carry them through.

For, after all, we must remember, even though we are a growing Party, and even though we will get 100,000 members before the end of the year, our 100,000 members will be operating in a country of 130,000,000 population. Conditions in the country and in the world are becoming more and more pressing, and are demanding that leadership which it is our task to give, in order to direct the majority of the 130,000,000 on the path of democracy, peace, and, eventually, socialism. That means that our forces, if we are really going to get out among the masses, are going to be spread pretty thin. You will not be able to come together for a consultation with highly developed Communists on all the questions you are going to be confronted with. Certainly, you are not going to be able to call Jack Stachel in every time you are faced with a trade union problem! He works pretty hard, but he cannot do the physically impossible.

More and more you will have to develop the abilities to find the solutions and unite our forces along the right road without prolonged inner-Party discussions. Discussions are very good when it is possible to have them; but you must learn to find your way in the midst of mass struggles when quick decisions have to be made and consultation is impossible. There a new kind of test is put upon you, representing the collectivity of our Party forces; you stand there alone, and you must be capable of immediately giving the same answer with your own

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unaided efforts that would be given if we could have a consultation of all the best minds of the Party. That is, you must represent the Party so well, and be grounded in our whole method of work and the conclusions that we have laid as the foundations for our work, that you can give the correct answer without any books, without any instructions, without any consultations, standing alone among great masses, engaged in the struggle—and not only give the correct answer, but know how to make that answer the answer that the masses will demand. Has our school helped you to face such tests as these? If the school has helped to prepare you for that kind of role—then the school has been successful.

ALERTNESS TO OUR MISTAKES FOR THE BETTER PERFORMANCE OF OUR TASKS

In applying to our own work in America the lessons of the experience of the much greater and more mature movement, our brother Party of the Soviet Union, we must study again and again Comrade Stalin's report to the plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, March 3, 1937: "Defects in Party Work and Measures for Liquidating the Trotskyites and Other Double-Dealers." It was published here in pamphlet form under the title *Mastering Bolshevism*.* Let us learn to apply in our own work and in our approach to our own problems, what Comrade Stalin told the Communist Party of the Soviet Union it must do in facing the new stages of its struggle, in wiping out the remnants of the enemy agents within the Soviet Union, the wrecking and spying bloc of Rights and Trotskyites—experiences that have a many-sided application to our own special circumstances and tasks in the United States. Especially, I want to stress one point that Comrade Stalin emphasized in that report. Comrade Stalin laid down the task of training cadres, training the leading personnel on the basis of a self-critical examination of their own mistakes. What does this mean? This is the very center of the whole process of self-criticism, the deepening of the mastery of Bolshevism by facing, combatting, and overcoming our own mistakes. This applies to the work of every individual, and especially to the collective work of every leading body that you may participate in. Comrade Stalin quoted a very profound paragraph from Lenin, which I want to read here as one of the leading thoughts that we all must keep before us at all times and in all of our work. Lenin said:

> "The attitude of a political party toward its own mistakes is one of the most important and surest criteria of the seriousness of the party, and of how it fulfills, *in practice*, its obligations toward its class and toward the masses of working people. To admit a mistake openly, to disclose its reasons, to analyze the conditions which gave rise to it, to study attentively the means of correcting it—these are the signs of a serious party; this means the performance of its duties, this means educating and training the class and, subsequently, the masses." (Cited in *Mastering Bolshevism*, p. 49.)

To be alert to mistakes, to define them properly, to understand their causes and how to correct them, and

* Joseph Stalin, *Mastering Bolshevism*, Workers Library Publishers, New York.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to do so in the full knowledge of all of the implications of the problem—this is what we are trying to accomplish in studying the essence of the methods of work based on the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. Comrade Stalin said:

"It is only on this path, only by open and honest self-criticism, that Bolshevik cadres can be educated, that real Bolshevik leaders can be educated."

TO LEAD THE MASSES WE MUST LEARN FROM THEM

A further point that I want to emphasize on the basis of Comrade Stalin's report is that we not only lead and teach the masses, but that we must learn from the masses. This means, first, that we must not become conceited. Conceit is fatal; it immediately divorces us from the masses. When we speak of Bolshevik modesty, we mean that approach to the masses which dissolves all barriers between us and brings us closer to them; which causes them to trust us, to have confidence in us; and you cannot possibly approach the masses and receive this response of confidence and trust if you consider that your title or your position or your previous education, or anything in the world, gives you any special privilege in relation to the masses, or that it gives you any warrant for issuing instructions to the masses, for talking down to them.

Now, there is still in our ranks a great deal of this conceit, of Communist vanity, arrogance or presumption, this feeling that, "Oh, if only the Central Committee would just give me an appointment and a title, what wonderful things I could do among the masses!" Every time the Central Committee runs up against that idea, we know that is precisely the instance calling for withholding any appointment or title. Anybody who depends upon an appointment or title from the Central Committee for work among the masses is not fitted to make the first steps for such work. And we in the Central Committee try to follow the policy of never giving an appointment or title to anybody until we are first assured that the person will not rely upon such appointment or title for his authority among the masses; because we know, the moment he begins to rely upon that, he is not going to extend the authority of our Party, but is going to break it down. He will be no good to the Central Committee; he will be a liability to us.

Secondly, in relation to the masses. In coming to the people with our program, we bring them something precious, something which they need. But to bring that program in a complete form, we must learn to adjust it to the particular needs of the workers to whom we are going, with the aim of jointly solving their problems. You have learned a great deal in this school, but when you get back to your own particular field of work, you are going to find that in none of the books you have read, nor in the lectures you have heard, was there any description of the special problem you are facing at that moment. And you are not going to be able to get the answer alone out of your own head, or your books, or your memory. Everything that you carry away from the school with you is going to help you only to the degree that you begin to tie up, very practically, simply, and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

modestly what you have learned here with the knowledge of the masses among whom you are working, while learning from them.

You are not going to be able to teach those masses a thing of what you have learned in this school, unless you begin first by learning from the masses with whom you are working. You must learn what their problems are, how these problems must be approached, and then translate what you can apply from your previous practical mass work and your experience in the school into that situation in terms of the life of the people among whom you are working. You must learn from the masses before you can teach them anything, and this applies not only to the details of the situation; the masses will teach you many things in the course of your work in leading them, and if you are not able to learn those lessons which the masses will teach you, you will not be able to lead them successfully. You must make your ear very sensitive to what the masses say, not only to what they say at public meetings, because they do not always speak up at public meetings, but to what they say among themselves after the meetings, in their homes, and at the work bench. You must know what they really think, what they really feel, and adjust yourself to them—connect yourself up with them.

When you go into any phase of mass work, the first thing you have to appreciate much more than ever before is that the masses, the working class, and the broad toiling masses generally, are made up of many component parts, and that there is no formula that applies to the masses as a whole. You have to find a particular approach to the most complicated differentiations among the masses. In the first place, we find as we go from industry to industry, the workers in the various industries present special characteristics that we must study and understand before we can do any serious, effective work in a particular industry.

Then, we find that running through the industries is another set of divisions—there are, for example, many national groups. These national groups are far from becoming less important, as used to be thought by some people who would predict that our national press, in the various languages, is something which is quickly going to die out. This is not at all the case. These nationalities and their influence do not disappear with the passing of the first generation of immigrants. The native-born American is about 35 per cent to 40 per cent, or perhaps more, first and second generations of these national immigrants, who still live in the tradition of their nationality, who still live in national communities, who still carry on their national traditions as Americans. They do not consider themselves at all people who are going back to the old country. They are Americans first, last and always, and never expect to be anything else, and are proud to be Americans. But, at the same time, they are also proud that they are Italian-Americans, or Polish-Americans, or German-Americans. And we have to study these special conditions of the particular sections of the masses and transform what at first seems like obstacles to our work into assets, into helping factors in our work. The mo-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment we begin to understand the traditions, the atmosphere, the problems of the specific national group, this knowledge becomes an instrument that we can use to solidify our work and to root ourselves deeper among the masses.

This is likewise true as regards all the special aspects of our work among the masses: work with the youth; work among women; that especially important task that grows more important all the time—winning the Negro people; and all such problems which are the manifestation of the masses as you come in contact with them in the various industries and localities. You have to prepare yourselves to translate the general truths of Bolshevism that you got from your theoretical study into the practical answers of how to work among particular people in a particular place, by understanding every phase of their problems, everything that influences their thoughts, everything that influences their feeling, and to connect our program with their aspirations for a better life right where they are.

FOR THE MASTERY OF MATERIALIST DIALECTICS

What is this method of work that we are talking about? I have not taken any time at all to talk politics in the sense of examining some of the immediate, concrete problems of our country or of the world—and there are plenty of problems to talk about—because I think the limited time at our disposal here is most valuably used if we concentrate upon the method of work. The method of work of Communist leadership, the method of work of Bolshevism, is what we are driving at all the time. The basis of this method of work arises out of our whole way of thinking. It is an expression of dialectical materialism. Now, I don't want to encourage you in the habit of going to trade union meetings to deliver lectures on dialectical materialism when the occasion doesn't call for it. I don't want to encourage you in the habit of taking a lot of the specialized philosophical language of dialectical materialism and sprinkling it mechanically through all your public speeches. You have to be especially careful that you make yourselves understood by the people to whom you are talking; but, also, if you are going to be very effective speakers to the masses, you yourselves must more and more understand, must more and more fully master the dialectical method and understand what you are doing, why you are doing it. Dialectics is the science of change, and everything that we do is aimed toward consciously directing the process of change. Our program, our ideas, do not come out of our own heads. That is why, when we speak philosophically, we combat very energetically idealist philosophies, which consider that the autonomous idea is the moving force in the world. Some people, even some very well educated people, and even some who call themselves Communists, think that when we oppose this idealist philosophy, we are fighting against all manifestations of what is popularly known as idealism, that is, devotion to ideals, devotion to program, devotion to impersonal ends. That is a grave mistake. We are opposed to idealist philosophy precisely because we have found a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much surer foundation and instrument for the pursuit of our ends—the realization of the devotion to our ideals by recognizing that these ideals are not the absolute ends that rule the world, but that they are themselves the product of the struggle of great social forces, and become the instruments of the struggle, the class struggle, the development of society—that all ideas are related to and expressed in this struggle, and that by understanding the foundations, the moving forces, we become the masters of the idea, of thought, as weapons in the class struggle.

Instead of being the passive adherents of thought and ideas, we achieve mastery over them, and this mastery is the mastery of dialectical materialism as established by Marx and Engels, and further developed by Lenin and Stalin. It is because we have begun to master Bolshevism, to master materialist dialectics, that we have been able to isolate and defeat all those enemies of the working class, who have tried to divert, disrupt, and demoralize our movement from within—the Trotsky-ite-Lovestoneite gang, who have become the agents of fascism. They try to operate with "Left"-sounding slogans and phrases, but they have very little success. There is not the slightest doubt that they would have done a hundred-fold more damage, if we had not had a Party sufficiently equipped with the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, to be able to reach the masses and to show them the deeper truths underlying the confusing surface of events and political life today. Because we were able to penetrate deeper into the problems, to see further into the future, we have established an influence among the masses radiating from our Party, that even our enemies must recognize. We have become one of the most potent influences upon the thought currents and political trends of the American people today. What gives us that far-reaching power of influencing thought is our mastery of Marxism-Leninism. Our specialized shock-troop enemies, the Lovestoneites and Trotskyites, refuse to speak of us with any other label today than that of "Stalinites"; they claim not to recognize that we are Communists, that we are Marxists, or Engelsists, or Leninists: we are only "Stalinists." But this label that is thrown against us as a term of derision we have learned to appropriate as a proud name, and we are glad to call ourselves Stalinists.

We have learned that among people who are influenced by, or respond to, political ideas, we can make a fundamental judgment of a person's political character, if he is at all informed or widely read, by his reactions toward Stalin. Anyone who is politically literate, who reads the current literature, who is informed about world affairs, and yet at the same time gives a negative reaction to Stalin—that person is moving towards, or is under the influence of, fascist ideologues. For even, in the case of a simple, honest democrat today, who has not the slightest inclination toward or sympathy with Communism, his interest in preserving democracy and peace, in the established facts of the power of the Soviet Union, with Stalin at its head, as the fortress for the preservation of democracy and peace in the world, necessitates, if that man is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an honest democrat, a positive reaction toward Stalin and Stalin's role. And as for those who go far beyond the simple, honest democrat, beyond the simple preservation of peace and democracy, who look forward to the guaranteeing of peace and democracy and the deepening of democracy to embrace all the phases of life; for those who look forward to the development, through the preservation of democracy and peace, toward the future socialist society—for all such people, if they are possessed of integrity, there can be only the reaction of the deepest respect, admiration, and love for the tremendous world-changing achievements that have been brought about by Stalin's leadership, and, therefore, for the personality of Stalin himself, as our most beloved guide and leader.

* * *

These are some of the important thoughts I wanted to express on this day of your graduation, to try to emphasize somewhat the direction of the whole course of study. We find ourselves in a world menaced by reaction and fascism, a world threatened with upheavals and counter-revolution, a world thrown into chaos by the rapid disintegration of the capitalist order of society, a world beset by the most complicated and difficult problems that are constantly becoming more complicated and more difficult; a world which at the same time, however, presents us more and more with the forces ripening for our program and for our leadership, increasingly responding to us, giving us the foundations upon which, and the instruments by means of which, all of these problems can be solved. The key to that solution is the steadily rising capacity of our own Party, of our own leading people; our constantly increased abilities and capacities, our constantly deepening understanding of our problems. Given this increased capacity on the part of our Party cadres, our Party leadership, spreading it more and more throughout our Party membership, and from them to the masses—given this increasing mastery of Bolshevism, we are going to organize the majority of the American people, and we are going to place our country firmly in the vanguard of world progress and world socialism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SOCIALIST PARTY CONVENTION

BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

A COUPLE of years ago, in my pamphlet entitled *The Crisis in the Socialist Party*,* I pointed out in detail that the basic cause for the failure of the Socialist Party, expressed graphically by its lessened mass influence and by the fact that the party has fewer members than when it started out in 1900, was because the Socialist Party had never followed a true class-struggle policy. That is, dominated since its foundation by opportunistic lawyers, doctors, writers, preachers, etc., it had failed in the two essentials necessary for its growth into a mass revolutionary party, namely, (a) it had not given a militant and practical lead to the workers in their daily struggles, and (b) it had not educated a solid core of clear-headed Socialist fighters trained in the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

In the same pamphlet I also pointed out that in the change of Socialist Party leadership and policy which was then taking place in "the Leftward turn" of the party, the Socialist Party was not ridding itself of the opportunism that historically had prevented its growth, but was merely giving this opportunism new forms. Thus, in place of its traditional open Right opportunism, the Socialist Party was developing a "Left sectarianism." The Socialist Party was also at the time injecting into its veins counter-revolutionary poison by accepting the Trotskyites into its ranks.

Together with other Communists, I stated that if this situation were not corrected, the decline of the Socialist Party would continue and that that party would be still further isolated from the masses. These warnings have turned out to be quite accurate. The Socialist Party leaders, deaf to friendly Communist analyses and admonitions, have plunged deeper and deeper into this ultra-Left course. It is true that they expelled the Trotskyites (whom we advised them not to accept in the first place) but they are nevertheless more and more permeated with Trotskyite and semi-Trotskyite policies.

The heart of the Socialist Party's present-day "Left" sectarianism is that the party rejects the central immediate issue of mass struggle today—that of democracy versus fascism—and tries instead to substitute for it that of socialism versus capitalism.

The "Left" sectarianism of the Socialist Party, more and more permeated with counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, also leads that party to reject the lessons of the Russian revolution of the revolutionary teachings of Marx, Lenin, Stalin and Dimitroff, and

*William Z. Foster, *The Crisis in the Socialist Party*, Workers Library Publishers, New York.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to rely upon the pseudo-revolutionary nonsense of Norman Thomas and Herbert Zam. Consequently, the Socialist Party still fails in both essentials for building a revolutionary party, that is, it does not work out an effective policy of mass leadership in the daily struggle, and it does not build up a trained body of socialist fighters. The inevitable outcome of its new Leftism, as we foretold, has been a still further decline of the party's numerical strength and influence.

The continuous decline of the Socialist Party was clearly to be seen at its 21st Convention, held April 21-23 in Kenosha, Wisconsin. The official figures claimed a dues-paying membership of only 6,194. Even accepting these low totals at face value, it would show a two-third drop from the party's membership of 19,121 in 1935. But in reality, the situation is still worse. The convention figure of 6,191 members was based on dues paid for the year ending Nov. 30, 1937; but since then further membership losses have taken place through splits in Reading, Connecticut, and California, and by the expulsion of the Trotskyites. Actually, the Socialist Party at present, by a generous estimate, has not more than 4,000 paying members, and the Young People's Socialist League, practically bankrupt, has only about 300.

The fall in the mass prestige of the Socialist Party has also proceeded apace. Its trade union influence is now almost negligible. Its political following, a hangover from its old traditions, is also manifestly diminishing. At the Kenosha Convention no reports could be made of important mass activities in any field. A significant indication of the declining influence of the Socialist Party was the fact that its convention was almost completely ignored by the labor, liberal and capitalist press, which in previous years always widely publicized Socialist Party conventions.

The work of the convention, in sum, only served to plunge the Socialist Party deeper into Leftist sectarianism. The convention did not analyze what is the matter with the policy of their party; it did not work out a program of practical mass leadership; it did not develop a perspective of revolutionary education. Its numerous resolutions tended generally in the direction of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, and their application must still further isolate the Socialist Party from the masses. Although the convention enveloped its policies in a maze of revolutionary phrases, this cannot alter their sectarian opportunist character.

On the vital question of defeating reaction and fascism in the United States, the convention showed no understanding of the present-day tasks of a revolutionary working class party. Instead of concentrating against the Wall Street bankers and their Republican and Democratic agents as the main enemy and then calling for a great democratic front in the coming elections to defeat them, the convention, with a flourish of revolutionary phrasemaking, singled out Roosevelt and the New Deal as the principal force to be defeated, and then set out to do this by splitting the progressive ranks through the development of a premature, sectarian labor party. Such a political line can have but two results: first to play into the hands of the reactionaries, and, second, to destroy the prestige of the Socialist Party as a mass leader.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the question of peace, the convention also adopted a policy which has nothing in common with the interests of the masses. While repudiating isolation in words, it spoke for isolationism in fact, which means surrender to the fascist war-makers. In taking this stand, the Socialist Party placed itself in contradiction to the line, not only of the Communist International, but also of the Socialist Second International and the Socialist-controlled International Federation of Trade Unions, all of which advocate a policy of collective security by the democratic nations to restrain the fascist aggressors. The Socialist Party, by this action, also runs counter to the developing mass collective security movement in this country. Although for the moment the Socialist Party may seem to gain some support by playing for those masses who still believe in isolationism, it will eventually pay the penalty by diminished mass contacts and influence.

On Spain the destructive character of the new "Left" sectarian line of the Socialist Party was glaringly manifest. The convention resolution delivered its main attack, not against Franco (Hitler and Mussolini were not even mentioned), but against the Communist International! It poured out great praise upon the discredited Largo Caballero, and shed crocodile tears over the Trotskyites and other counter-revolutionaries now justly in the jails of Loyalist Spain. It carefully refrained from endorsing the Negrin government, so opposed is the Socialist Party to the People's Front. The flight of the Socialist Party from its earlier policy of open opportunism to its present one of sectarian opportunism is well exemplified by the facts that six years ago the Socialist Party supported the Hindenburg government in Germany, which was then, with the help of the Social-Democratic leaders, preparing the way for Hitler, while now the Socialist Party, in its new ultra-Leftism, refuses to endorse the Spanish People's Front government notwithstanding its heroic fight against fascism.

On the U.S.S.R., the convention also failed signally. In substance, the Soviet Union was considered not as the land of socialism, but as just another imperialist power. Its great achievements in building socialism were ignored, its peace policy was repudiated and slandered, its trials of the Trotskyite-Bukharinite traitors were denounced as "frame-ups," its proletarian dictatorship was lumped together with the fascist dictatorships, a la Hearst. All of which signifies that the Socialist Party does not recognize the revolution when it sees it, and that it has no inkling of the problems of the actual building of socialism. The great revolutionary lessons of the Soviet Union are quite lost upon it. Although the Socialist Party seems quite unaware of the fact, one of the basic reasons for its failure to grow is this hostile attitude towards the Soviet Union. So long as it persists in this, the Socialist Party can never hope to win the allegiance of the most militant and progressive sections of the working class without whom the Socialist Party cannot be built.

The convention delivered many attacks against the Communist Party. The Communist Party policy, which is fast building our Party into a mass Party, was condemned as crassest op-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

portunism. The Communist Party was slanderously accused of thuggery, suppression of Party and trade union democracy, warmongering, expulsions of Socialists from Communist-led trade unions, cooperation with the police against Socialists, and a host of other imaginary crimes, much along the Pegler, Stolberg Red-baiting line. The convention provided no basis for the Socialist Party united front work with the Communists, but it raised no objection to Socialists cooperating with the notorious fascist Hamilton Fish in the "Keep America Out of War" Committee.

The convention was torn with factionalism. The two principal factions were the Clarity group, led by the renegade Zam, and the Militant group, headed by Thomas. The main bone of contention between them was the extent to which the Socialist Party should go in the direction of Trotskyism. The Clarity group, which is fast degenerating into Trotskyism, secured the upper hand in the convention and in the newly-elected National Executive Committee. This assures that the Socialist Party in the coming period will plunge still deeper into the morass of sectarian opportunism that is ruining it.

The convention was destitute of enthusiasm. It has been followed by confusion and pessimism in the dwindling Socialist Party ranks. The Thomas group is especially demoralized and is evidencing definitely liquidatory tendencies. It may eventually quit the Socialist Party and, in the main section, New York, merge its identity into the American Labor Party.

The Kenosha Convention re-emphasized the fact that the Socialist Party, due to its uncured opportunism, does not know how to fight for socialism. It has only one-fifth as many members as it had when it was launched 38 years ago. During the mass upheaval of the past several years, a period of great mass political awakening and sharpened class struggle, of swift trade union growth, and of rapid expansion of the Communist Party, the Socialist Party continues to dwindle and decline. This is because of its wrong policies, a fact which such empty political leaders as Norman Thomas and Herbert Zam cannot understand. Unless the Socialist Party drastically changes its present political line it will degenerate altogether into a harmful sect, a barrier in the path of working class progress.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PEOPLE'S STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM IN BRAZIL

BY MARINA LOPES

THE economic and political situation in Brazil became increasingly acute towards the end of 1931 and throughout 1932. Evidences of resistance against the employers' offensive manifested themselves among the workers. A wave of strikes swept the country, particularly in Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro. In the main these strikes took the form of protests against wage cuts, increase of working hours, and fines. Some of these strikes, however, affected important and basic industries, such as meat-packing, railroad, textile and printing. This mood of resistance gradually developed into a struggle for improved economic conditions which in some instances assumed political significance.

Deep discontent also prevailed in the countryside. Hatred flared up against the feudal and pre-capitalist forms of exploitation, found even in the most advanced and developed plantations in Rio and Sao Paulo. Even less hopeful were the conditions of large sections of the middle classes, staggering under the load of taxes, high cost of living and widespread unemployment. The Brazilian people were indignant at the numerous arrests of strikers who were deported to the Island of Porcos and Colonia de Dois Rios. Moreover, a wave of popular sentiment for a return to a constitutional government once again rose above the seething surface of Brazilian life.

The main centers of unrest were Sao Paulo, Rio, and Pernambuco. An armed struggle broke out aginst Vargas in Sao Paulo that same year.

It was in this very period that reaction rallied to the banner of the Integralistas. Characteristically the sinister portent of the movement was underestimated by the public which regarded it merely as a group of malcontents and petty adventurers. But the chief aim of the Integralistas, as of all fascist organizations, was to smash the growing national and progressive movement of the people. They were organized to stem the tide of the people's demand for democratic rights. It may not be amiss here to recall to the reader that these very rights which the people so passionately desired had been promised to them prior to 1930 and still remained unfulfilled.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Integralistas were the first fascist party organized on a national scale, it is worth noting that attempts to create fascist cells can be traced back long

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

before the birth of the Integralistas. Fascism in Brazil found fertile soil first among the Italian inhabitants. For example, the Fascio de Combate do Rio de Janeiro had its inception as far back as 1923. It was, however, only after the 1930 revolution* that these fascist seedlings developed and took definitive form among the Brazilian people. Even then their growth was forced in an atmosphere of muddled fascist propaganda. It held itself out as a method of coping with the increasing revolutionary movement. Government officials hailed the fascist creation as a means of protecting the "fruits of the 1930 revolution."

These nascent fascist organizations aped the Italian pattern. Their major attention was given to organizational forms; legions, centurions, decuries, uniforms and so forth. Newspapers printed instructions regarding the formation of legions, Preeminent among the sponsors of these legions were Oswaldo Aranha, present Minister for Foreign Affairs, and Francisco Campo, present Minister of Justice, then leader of the Legion 3 de Outubro.

These fascist groupings did not immediately succeed. They failed to wring any response from the people. They were ridiculed out of existence, or were not robust enough to stand the light of day. But this did not mean that the fascists threw up the sponge. They learned from their defeats and were able to stage a successful comeback under the name of Accao Integralista Brasileira. Backed and blessed by the largest foreign capitalists, principally Crespi and Count Matarazzo, who control a chain of 85 enterprises, they chose for their emblem the Greek mathematical sign *integral,* and for the color of their uniform green—a "patriotic" gesture to the Brazilian flag.

Their platform professes allegiance to a triple conception: God, Fatherland and Family. These catchwords, according to fascist intellectuals, are romantically and abstractly interpreted to mean: Good, Beautiful and True. Forming the *base* of their platform, these abstractions serve to conceal integral aims. Under the slogan "God, Fatherland and Family" the fascists disseminate a brand of religious mysticism and hypocritical anti-imperialism and anti-capitalism—coated with anti-Semitism. In practice this results in a brutal and terroristic assault on the well-being and the interests of the Brazilian nation.

Fascism in Brazil has utilized and combined in a very efficient manner the different characteristics of Italian and German fascism. This applies to doctrinaire questions as well as to methods and forms of organization. In transplanting these forms the Brazilian fascists have also craftly considered the social traditions and the economic set-up of the country. They assert that they stand for an integral Brazil, a strong Brazil, a new Brazil, a corporative Brazil, a totalitarian Brazil. The term "corporative Brazil" is intended to appease the Italian immigrants, who still retain close ties with their homeland, and to satisfy Italian fascism. The term "totalitarian Brazil" caters to the ambitions of Germany and the Nazi organizations within the country. Integral Brazil and a "new, strong Brazil" are phrases cal-

* The revolution led by the Alianca Liberal, in which Vargas took power, deposing President Washington Luiz.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

culated to arouse the healthy national aspirations of the Brazilians. In brief, they are all things to all men. Inconsistencies are immaterial. The object is to catch the chauvinistic emotions of different groups with the handiest bait.

In the words of Gustavo Barroso, one of the leaders of the Integralistas, "the integral nation stands on two pillars: nationalism and corporativism." Other definitions of the fascist state run as follows:

"Integralism, as the very name of the movement implies, wants the cooperation of all forces for the realization of the integral state, which is the state identified with the nation, as a synthesis of its highest spiritual and material values." (*A Offensiva*, January 25, 1937)

A proclamation of the fascist faith declares:

"Integralismo combats all the parties, does not recognize classes and wants a united nation, a national state, a strong state, a heroic state. The government must no longer be elected by the parties which divide the nation, but by the totalitarian nation, by the means of corporations." (*Ibid.*)

Fascism takes cognizance of the conditions and sentiments of the people in order to canalize the latter in its own reactionary direction. An interesting aspect in this connection is the Integralista attitude toward the Church. To understand the significance of this problem one or two facts must be borne in mind. The Roman Catholic Church has, economically speaking, one of its most precious strongholds in Brazil; great latifundias and real properties. The upper hierarchy of the Church is predominant in Rio, Sao Paulo and Minas. In the Northeast a very large section of representatives of the Church officiate amidst an impoverished population. Very often they themselves are victimized by these same miserable conditions.

These circumstances necessarily influence their approach to religion and politics. Many of these priest have therefore become liberal and progressive. But some elements within the upper hierarchy of the Church pretend to speak for all Catholics and to shepherd all of the vast and divergent flock into the fold of the reactionaries. To achieve this purpose reaction formed the Accao Catholica (Catholic Action) in 1936.

It is also important to keep in mind that while Brazil is one of the richest countries in the world, its population suffers profound poverty. Education is extremely limited. The people are deprived of the most elementary economic and civic rights. The comforts of religious faith are the only consolation abundantly available to them.

Fascism attacks the most progressive elements within the Church. Father Manuel do Nascimento together with several others were arrested for expressing democratic and humane beliefs. Simultaneously, fascism seeks an alliance with the Accao Catholica. In his book. *Why I Am an Integralista*, A. Pompeu, preaching the alliance with the Accao Catholica, says:

"The fact that the two great forces—Catholicism and Integralism—travel along parallel roads and combat a common enemy does not alter the thesis that the second harbors all the spiritualists."

Concerning the underprivileged masses, fascism sheds the following words of light:

"Just as the Church convinced man that he must content himself with his lot on earth, in the same way. She can orientate the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

associations of class, in the opposite direction of revolt and violence. This was admirably understood by fascism." (A. Pompeu, *The Defense of Brazil.*)

In this way Integralism endeavors to exploit religion to promote fascist aims.

Integralism tries to present itself as "protector of the Church" in order to appear before the masses as a pure, moral and respectable movement. In this respect it has not met with complete success. The real meaning of fascism to religion was exposed by Frei Seizing of the Santo Antonio Convento in Rio. A statement recently published and signed by numerous clergymen and Catholic organizations, expressing indignation against the Nazi persecution of German people because of religious beliefs, has made a deep impression among Brazilian Catholics.

Integralism, like fascism in general, poses as an alternative to capitalism and socialism. It fulminates "against the Jewish capitalism of the United States and against the Jewish socialism of the Soviet Union." It considers the French Revolution as the most "disastrous event in history." *"Egalité, Fraternité et Liberté"* is the antithesis of "God, Fatherland, and Family." The latter trinity are magic words to befuddle the minds of the people and trick them into fascism.

Opposed to democracy, the Integralistas advocate its complete abolition:

"Democratic liberalism is kindred to communism, and in fact, exaggerated liberalism brings about the idea of equality, and from this idea arises the communist movement of revolt against natural inequality, which can disappear only in heaven. We must therefore combat exaggerated liberalism in order to avoid communism." *(Ibid.)*

The development of propaganda against the class struggle and for class collaboration comprises one of their main objectives. In order to make this idea palatable to the downtrodden and embittered people they spice it with "anti-capitalist" sauce:

"Integralism is against communism which provokes the class struggle, . . . is against the enslavement of man to capital, to the machine, to disorder and to the material instincts." (*A Offensiva,* January 25, 1937.)

Carried away by the frenzy of their anti-capitalist demagogy, they boast that the integral state will prevent "labor from being reduced to a commodity" and will "abolish the law of supply and demand."

Their platform abounds with the fanfare of "a liberated Brazil." But the way to Brazil's liberation they contend will be accomplished only through a closer alliance with Germany and Italy. This is a convenient pretext to increase German and Italian control in Brazil at the expense of England and the United States. It kills the proverbial two birds with one stone. It casts the Integralistas in the role of "true" Brazilians whose only interest is a great and free Brazil. In reality, however, it serves the interest of the fascist imperialists to the detriment of the Brazilian nation.

The anti-Semitic campaign in Brazil has the general characteristics of anti-Semitism everywhere. Of course, in Brazil it has been adapted to suit the peculiar native conditions there. So it was essential for the Integralistas to connect the anti-Semitic campaign with the "anti-imperialist" demagogy. Fascism, the Integralistas claim, "will liberate national labor from foreign imperialism." In a very clever and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cunning way, they play up the fact that Rothschild, who is only one of many bankers controlling large portions of the Brazilian economy, is a Jew. From this isolated case they build up the theory that anti-Semitism is indispensable in order to "liberate the fatherland."

The anti-Semitic drive is also an integral part of the anti-Communist campaign. "Communism is an exotic plant imported by the Jews" say the Integralistas. All foreigners who manifest any preferences for democracy and liberty are eyed with suspicion by the police and government officials. They are branded as "Jews," characters of "ill repute," and in the same breath condemned as "Communists."

Anti-Semitism has assumed serious proportions in the southern states, where the German population is concentrated. But in reality, anti-Semitism has not taken hold of the Brazilian people. From its very inception, Brazil was made up of native Indians, African Negroes, and Portuguese, among whom were a great number of Jews or "New Christians" who had fled from the Inquisition in Portugal. It is said by many historians that Jews were among the first settlers in Brazil and that they comprised the bulk of the colonists until the period of the division of the country into "capitanias."* The Brazilian writer, Nelson Tabajara de Oliveira, declared:

> "In Brazil, to go against the Jews is to go against our ancestors. At the end of the seventeenth century all the doctors, lawyers and artisans in general, were 'New Christians.' Many Jews were also merchants and could also be found in agriculture. They continued to work and to prosper, identifying themselves more and more with our joys and sorrows, and they are today assimilated into the lineage of the basic families of our nation." (*Porque ser anti-semita?* p. 206.)

Jews have immeasurably contributed to the revolutionary struggles and traditions of Brazil. The Brazilians cherish the memory of the Portuguese Jew, Retecliff, who was one of the organizers of the first Republican movement, Confederacao do Equador, and a staunch fighter for independence, for which cause he was hanged.

Fascism propagates the idea of an imperialist Brazil. It should be remembered, however, that Brazil is not an independent country in the complete sense of the word. Its dependence has become greater since the November *coup d'etat*. It is clear that the fascists have no intention of transforming Brazil into an independent imperialist country but rather secretly hope to tie Brazil to the expansionist kite of fascist Germany and Italy. In line with this they agitate for a strong navy and army equipped with the best armaments. The functions of this army and navy are indicated in the following:

> "The army will work to establish the consolidation of imperialism inside national frontiers and the navy will carry to other people the unifying word of international policy: God, Fatherland and Family!" (*Why I Am an Integralista*, p. 20.)

In other words, internally the armed forces will maintain fascism and defend its dictatorship; in external politics they will be used as an instrument in behalf of Hitler and Mussolini—ready to carry the banner of "civilization," of "God, Fatherland and Family" into other South American lands. In this way the fascists foment hatred against other peoples and na-

* W. Sombart: *Die Juden und das Wirtschaftsleben*, p. 31; also Solidonio Leite Filho: *Judeus no Brazil*.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions. They breed prejudices against the Argentinian people. Plinio Salgado, the Brazilian "Fuehrer," in a public meeting, dramatically declaimed that "Notwithstanding the fact that Argentinian bayonets have never paraded on the streets of Rio, soon however the Brazilian flag will float over Buenos Aires." Domestically Brazil is already at war. It is under a proclaimed "state of war" which according to the government is equivalent to war with a foreign country.

Integralism parades as a genuine Brazilian movement. It resorts to demagogic "aboriginal exaltation" in order to give its movement a "tropical touch" and a "Brazilian flavor." Thus, the Integralistas have adopted as their salute, *Anaue,* an Indian greeting, now the Integralista equivalent for Heil Hitler. But in daily life this so-called "aboriginal exaltation" is reduced to more prosaic forms of expression and application. In the interior of the country, the inhabitants are compelled to join the Integralista movement, also known as the "green shirts." Then, their lands are confiscated. This is the ironical realism of the fascist slogan that "All Brazilians must become used to the idea of having duties without thinking of their rights" as a means of "becoming truly integrated in the consciousness of the great fatherland."* However, this sublime integration does not take place peacefully. It meets with stiff resistance. The Indians of the Posto de Paraguassu rebelled against the expropriation of their lands. These movements of resistance, not only against fascists but against landlords too, are contemptuously referred to as a "Communist movement." And there is no peace for those that resist. They are marked as outlaws. Escape means hiding in the jungles where many meet with death from starvation, thirst, and attacks from wild beasts.

At the outset, Integralism was unable to enlist many supporters. During the period of the unionization drive, the Integralistas directed their main fire against the already existing trade unions and against the movement for unionization. Fascism everywhere strives to crush the independent organization of the workers: This was the policy, likewise, of the Integralistas. "War to the death on the trade unions" became their actual slogan. Their armed groups attacked workers' meetings and trade union headquarters. They counted on and received the support of the police.

After Hitler's seizure of power in Germany in 1933, the Integralista movement gained momentum. Its adherents revamped their program and refined their damagogy. Their activities were coordinated with those of the Nazi organizations in the states of Parana and Santa Catharina. Their ranks swelled. Branches were established on a national scale. Nevertheless, the advent of fascism in Germany, which gave impetus to the development of a fascist movement in Brazil, at the same time intensified the desire of the workers for unity. It made clear the necessity for the formation of a broad democratic front against the fascist onslaughts. At the end of 1934 the trade unions arrived at an agreement and the first steps were taken for the creation of the Trade Union Congress of Unity and the establish-

* Gustavo Barroso, *O Integralismo do Norte ao Sul,* p. 93.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment of the Unitarian Trade Union Federation of Brazil.

The trade unions began to resist fascist attacks, parades and demonstrations. The Brazilian people answered the fascist invasion of the Textile Trade Union Center in Petropolis and the murder of its leader Leonardo Candu by the German fascist Matheus Hang with a general strike A fascist conference scheduled to take place in Bahia was scotched by a general strike. When the "chief" arrived in Bahia, he was unable to find anyone to carry his luggage; there was no taxi to transport him and there were no accommodations in any hotel for him. Afraid of the temper of the people, he "postponed" the conference and left Bahia immediately.

Because of this organized offensive of the trade unions, the Integralistas endeavored to make a tactical change in their trade union policies. They did not abandon gangsterism. However, they studied ways of carrying out their insidious plans more efficiently. Continuing terroristic activities, they conducted a tactical campaign of fascist organization within the government-controlled trade unions. They made extravagant promises to be fulfilled under a "totalitarian state." They held trade union conventions with the collaboration of the employers, the police and the government.

The Integralistas grew stronger. Their organization, functioning under a military discipline, was divided on a territorial basis into Provisional Committees consisting of departments, such as military, propaganda, branches in factories, schools, rural districts, army barracks, navy, the fire and police departments. They became the spearhead of the Vargas offensive to outlaw the National Liberation Alliance.

When the November, 1935, uprising took place, fascism was already collaborating with Vargas, offering him its voluntary and "patriotic" services. This was greatly appreciated by Vargas as a "proof of support and cooperation in the national defense and as a comforting testimony of the civic vitality indicating that the nation can count at any time on the energy and support of all good brazilians."

Under the cloak of the "state of war," democratic rights were abolished, thousands of democrats were imprisoned and fascism flourished. With the help of the government and the use of its apparatus, Integralist organizations grew like mushrooms. They made their way into strategic positions in the government, the police, the army and navy. The path to fascism was open.

The fascist offensive in Brazil was not a sudden overnight phenomenon. The Integralistas, hand in hand with fascist Italy and Germany, had been at work for a long time in a concentrated and studied drive. A knowledge of the special characteristics of Brazil may make the reasons behind this fascist concentration more readily understood. Later it will become clear how the road to fascism in Brazil was paved.

A. Brazil is the fourth largest country in the world. Its area is 8,494,299 square kilometers. Some states of Brazil are larger than several European countries put together. The state of Matto Grosso is three times as large as France. Brazil has 47,000,000 inhabitants and is therefore the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ninth largest nation in the world, from the point of view of population.

B. In natural wealth Brazil ranks among the richest nations. In this country are located the earth's largest iron reserves. In some regions the iron deposits consist of almost pure iron ore mountains. Agriculturally, it is no less rich. It produces 67 per cent of the world's coffee. But even though coffee is its most important commodity, this does not mean that Brazil is a monocultural country. Brazil is the third largest producer of cotton, second in cocoa and third in rubber, not to mention the production of sugar and other products.

C. In Brazil are concentrated the interests of the Anti-Communist Alliance of the fascist powers. There is in Brazil a large portion of Italian, German and Japanese immigrants and their descendants.

One can easily see why Brazil is an irresistible, attractive morsel to the fascist imperialists. In the first place, it is a source of raw materials and a large consumers' market. But the fascist powers are leading toward a world war. Brazil therefore means more than just trade relations to them. A strong foothold in Brazil will furnish them with the raw materials for ammunitions, foodstuff for their armies, an ally against the democratic countries on the American continent, and, above all, a strategic military base in South America. Already it is reported that Brazil is supplying coffee tablets for the Japanese army.

Long before the coup, progressive members of Congress, the press, and sincere representatives of the Brazilian people, exposed both the military preparations that were being made, and the sinister links that connected Vargas to Hitler, Mussolini, and even Franco.

Congressman Mangabeira, almost a year before the Vargas coup, stated:

> "I do not know of another country where things could happen as they are happening in Brazil today, without provoking an instinctive upheaval of public opinion. The government itself is taking steps to throw Brazil into frank disorder so as to take advantage of it later when political supremacy is knocked off its feet. . . . What country is this where its head organizes cold-bloodedly a civil war which he will unleash when he thinks that the situation is propitious?"

A few days before Congress was dissolved, Congressman Cafe Filho proved and exposed the preparation for the fascist coup. He pointed out that this assault against democracy in Brazil was being organized under the political guidance of Germany and the fascist powers, under the supervision of Von Kossel, chief of the Nazis in Brazil; by Chiappini, an official of the Italian army and general inspector of fascism in Brazil; and Swada, agent of the Japanese penetration. He proved that Germany had made a loan of *six thousand contos de reis* to Plinio Salgado, the fascist chief, through the Banco Transatlantico Allemao in Rio de Janeiro. Cafe Filho warned again and again that Brazilian sovereignty was threatened. He agitated against the fascist provocations, the open activities of the Gestapo, and the treachery of Vargas.

In the first days of November, Cafe Filho denounced the preparation by the government of terroristic acts, such as the plots to blow up certain railroads and to cripple the electric and gas supply in Rio. This was to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

give color to an alleged Communist plot and thus furnish the pretext for suppressing the forthcoming elections. In spite of a reign of terror, the heroic Communist Party of Brazil warned the people of the imminent Vargas coup and called upon all Brazilians to join the national democratic front against fascism. As late as November, 1936, James Waterman Wise, returning from Brazil with a delegation sponsored by the Brazilian Committee, informed the American people of the danger of a fascist dictatorship in Brazil.

Provocation was one of the methods used by Vargas to destroy the progressive movement and to suppress democracy in Brazil. Every advance of reaction and fascism in the past years, which led to the November coup, has been achieved under the smoke screen of a "struggle against Communism" and the necessity of smashing a "Communist plot." These slogans were used against the great wave of strikes in 1933-34, and gave rise to the ultra-reactionary National Security Act. Later under this slogan and by means of this National Security Act, the National Liberation Alliance, headed by Luiz Carlos Prestes, the Brazilian leader, was outlawed. By the same strategy Vargas provoked and brutally crushed the uprising of November, 1935, and instituted a reign of terror, a "state of war" and the "legalization" of mass imprisonment, tortures and murders, the violations of the Brazilian Constitution and Special Tribunals on the Hitler pattern. The democratic rights of the people were being defeated under the cloak of "defense of democracy." But not even with these measures could Vargas stop the discontent and the indignation that were spreading among the masses. The struggle for the salvation of the fatherland from the fascist catastrophe continued.

The people in the middle of 1937 began openly to show their opposition to Vargas and his maneuvers to prevent the 1938 elections from being held. Democratic candidates were chosen: Armando Salles and Jose Americo. The democratic movement spread and won a partial victory. The minister of justice was forced to resign. The "state of war" was called off. The demoralization of the Special Tribunals became a fact. Light was cast on the crimes committed during the state of war. The struggle against fascism and the domination of Brazil by Germany and Italy became the main duty of true Brazilians. Democratic centers against the Integralistas developed all over the country. Progressive, liberal, and workers' organizations as well as farmers and individuals were called to unite in one single camp; into a broad national democratic front offering resistance to fascism under the following program:

1. Democratization of the country, amnesty for political prisoners, complete restoration of the Brazilian Constitution and of democratic rights.
2. Struggle against fascism and the fascist imperialist bloc.
3. Integrity of the states and national unity, against the dismemberment of Brazil by the fascist powers.

But at the same time reaction and fascism were working hard. Tremendous pressure was exerted to prevent the acquittal of Luiz Carlos Prestes, most outstanding leader of the Brazil-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ian people. The fascist General Villanova cabled a protest against the decision of the Military Supreme Court acquitting some of the political prisoners. This cable was printed and broadly distributed by the Ministry of war. A "Communist plot" was faked. A Red-baiting campaign swept the country. The slogan of "neither Communism nor fascism" was raised in order to confuse the issues, to divide the democratic forces, and, as such, to place obstacles to the formation of a democratic front that could be a barrier to fascism. Many liberals fell prey to this demagogy. A state of war was again declared, and a junta was formed to supervise its application. This step was followed days later by the November coup, the abolition of the Brazilian Constitution, the dissolution of Parliament and all elected bodies, the banning of political parties, the arrest of all democratic forces that still were free. A Brazilian "totalitarian" state was created. Fascism in Brazil did not come suddenly. Brazilian events have proved once again the correctness of Comrade Dimitroff's statement:

"Before the establishment of a fascist dictatorship, bourgeois governments usually pass through a number of preliminary stages and institute a number of reactionary measures which directly facilitate the accession to power of fascism."

The people of the United States should derive valuable lessons from the painful experiences which the Brazilian people are going through. Those experiences should make clearer than ever before that the issue confronting the world today is not fascism versus Communism, but democracy versus fascism; that Red-baiting is but a screen for concealing the furthering of fascism, and that the defeat of fascism renders necessary the formation of a broad people's democratic front.

Fascism assumes a special form in each country, depending upon the economic, social and historical conditions of the given country. One of the outstanding peculiarities of fascism in Brazil flows from the circumstance that while Brazil is dependent on American and English capital, fascism does not grow directly from these two sources. On the contrary, it emanates directly from Germany, Italy and Japan, who covet Brazil's natural resources and riches. This peculiarity creates a series of problems both in the international and national arenas. On the one hand, it gives the Vargas clique an opportunity to use nationalistic measures and demagogy in order to enlarge its mass base—as, for example, the suspension of payments on foreign debts owed mainly to England and the United States. (The Vargas dictatorship will continue to crush the Brazilian people in order to extract from them the resources that were supposed to be used as payments on foreign debts and will use this money to destroy the democratic movement.) On the other hand, this peculiarity that enabled Vargas to maneuver is also one of the reasons for the instability of his dictatorship. It accounts for the sharpening of the antagonism between the United States and England and the fascist imperialists.

As a consequence, there is a sharpening of the antagonism within Brazil between the different bourgeois-landlord elements that are in one way

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or another connected with the United States and England and the fascist clique in league with Germany and Italy. It has its repercussions in Integralismo, accentuating its already existing factions, trends and groups. These peculiarities and the hatred of the Brazilian people for fascism can be counted among the reasons that brought Vargas to deny that his November coup was of a fascist character. Thus, at the time of the coup, the slogan of unity of all democratic forces was correctly raised against the consolidation of fascism in Brazil to accelerate its defeat. In his analysis of fascism as an unstable power, Comrade Dimitroff stated in his Report to the historic Seventh Congress of the Communist International:

". . . the accession to power of fascism must not be conceived of in so simplified and smooth a form, as though some committee or other of finance capital decided on a certain date to set up a fascist dictatorship. In reality, fascism usually comes to power in the course of a mutual, and at times severe, struggle against the old bourgeois parties, or a definite section of these parties, in the course of a struggle even within the fascist camp itself—a struggle which at times leads to armed clashes, as we have witnessed in the case of Germany, Austria and other countries."

It was not to be expected that the struggle for the consolidation of fascism in Brazil could take place smoothly. On the contrary the recent putsch of a faction of the Integralistas but confirms the analysis of Dimitroff.

The course of events that followed the November coup aggravated tremendously the inner conflicts already existing in the none-too-cohesive fascist organizations. The Integralistas are divided into various groups:

1. Those that want an open policy of collaboration with Germany and Italy, a so-called "pure fascism" (the Plinio Salgado, Belmiro Valverde faction);

2. Those that are for fascism in Brazil but do not wish to antagonize the United States, and are for maneuvering until fascism is consolidated;

3. Those that want the development of the most brutal anti-Semitic measures (Gustavo Barroso); etc.

In 1937 large numbers of rank-and-file members and outstanding intellectuals deserted the Integralista movement, with which they had affiliated under the illusion that they were fighting for the progress of Brazil, when they found that they were being used to promote the advance of Germany and Italy, for the subordination of Brazil to the fascist powers. At the same time many Catholics, followers of Integralismo, were disaffected by the religious persecution in Germany. Vargas took cognizance of all these currents and tried to maneuver in this regard, posing at that time as an "impartial" element, as an element of "conciliation." Furthermore, Vargas realized also at that time the necessity of enlarging his mass support, of regimenting to the "totalitarian state" certain strata of the population refractory to fascism, or at least to neutralize them. He took in account the hatred of the people for fascism, the political and personal demoralization of some of the Integralista leaders.

A few days before his coup, Vargas tried to form a "Uniao Nacional" (national party) with the Integralistas as backbone. This tentative plan

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

failed. After the coup, Vargas thought it more tactful to place in leading posts of the new government elements other than some of the Integralista Plinio faction. Despite that, he still offered Plinio Salgado the Ministry of Justice. At first, before the coup, Vargas thought that fascism could be consolidated through an open and bold alliance with Germany and Italy. With their help and the aid of the Integralistas, he carried out the November *coup d'etat*. After the coup, pressed by circumstances, Vargas, as stated above, denied "all connections with the fascist powers." Further, under the pressure brought into Brazilian politics by the United States and Oswaldo Aranha, former Brazilian ambassador at Washington and now foreign minister, Vargas was obliged to retreat and to make certain changes in his policies toward Germany and Italy; later, even to take measures detrimental to the fascist powers.

This pressure is evidenced by: (a) the reiterated warning of the U. S. State Department to the fascist powers and their allies in South America; the readiness of the United States to uphold the Monroe Dostrine, to resist and oppose the aims of the Fascist Alliance in South America; (b) the behind-the-scenes economic pressure as regards coffee exports and credits; (c) the pressure brought through other countries, such as Argentina, for the curtailment of Nazi organizations and activities in South America —*e.g.*, the meeting held in Rio between the American Ambassador Caffery and the Brazilian and Argentinian representatives; (d) the steps taken to neutralize the anti-Semitic drive that has spread intensely through South America since last November; (e) the development of a propaganda campaign to counteract fascist influence (radio broadcasts, etc.); and the pressure of the democratic force of American people.

The Integralistas supported Vargas in his 1937 coup; but since then the Plinio Salgado faction has been seeking a firmer policy. At the time of the coup Vargas was able to deliver a severe blow to the democratic movement. The movement was not smashed, however. Serious resistance developed. It is interesting to note that Vargas has until now been unable to carry through his proposed "reorganization of the government apparatus." This resistance, the popular growing discontent with Vargas, as well as the United States pressure against German penetration in Brazil, obliged Vargas to make more concessions. The background of the recent fascist putsch lies in the fact that Vargas was unable to solve Brazilian problems in the manner desired by Italy and Germany. The promises made in exchange for support were not fulfilled, not because he was opposed to them, but because he was forced to a more moderate course of action. Thus torn by an internal and external pressure, Vargas found it extremely difficult to fulfil his promises to the fascist powers.

Part of the Integralistas understood it. The Plinio faction did not. Since this group desired a more nazified regime than the dictator was able to grant, the revolt may be characterized as a putsch of certain dissatisfied fascist elements, under the instigation of Germany and Italy. The statement of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Brazilian Ambassador in Washington that the Vargas regime is a "democratic one" was an attempt to confuse American public opinion. The defeat of the Plinio putsch in Rio, likewise does not mean that fascism is smashed, or that democracy reigns in Brazil. New events and armed clashes are brewing.

Fascism is the main enemy of the Brazilian people, and the people's struggle against the Integralistas will continue. The guarantee for the defeat of fascism and the establishment of democracy in Brazil does not lie in the Vargas dictatorship, but in the unity of all true Brazilians against international fascism, the smashing of the entire fascist movement within the country, insuring the return of the country to the 1934 Constitution; the restitution to the Brazilian people of Prestes and all those democratic forces who have been kept in prison since November, 1935; the holding of new elections in which the people can express freely their desire for democracy, progress and national integrity.

More than ever do the Brazilian people need the active support of the working class and all progressives of the United States. This support will help to weld together the bonds that unite these two people. It will strengthen the forces contributing to the establishment of a democratic front and the defeat of fascism, not only in Brazil and in the United States, but throughout the Western Hemisphere.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BUKHARIN—THE PATH OF A TRAITOR

BY V. J. JEROME

"The dying classes resist, not because they have become stronger than we are, but because socialism is growing faster than they are, and they are becoming weaker than we. And because they are becoming weaker, they feel that their last days are approaching and are obliged to resist with every means and method in their power.

"Such is the mechanism of the sharpening of the class struggle and the resistance of the capitalists at the present historical moment." (Joseph Stalin, *Leninism,* Vol. II, pp. 128-9.)

BUKHARIN, whom the bourgeoisie and all the enemies of Marxism-Leninism find it in their interest to play up as the great "theoretician," was basically, in theory and practice, never a Marxist. His whole outlook and activity were alien to Marxism and Marxian dialectics. He maintained a wrong position, which recurred continually—on historical materialism, in which he revealed himself as a crass mechanist; on the question of the analysis of imperialism, the state and revolution, the national question, the role of the peasantry and the allies of the proletariat, the vanguard role of the Communist Party—on the entire prospect and program of socialist construction. With cliques about him, now "Left," now "Right," he carried on chronic factional struggles against the Party, entering into shady relationships with anti-Party and anti-Soviet elements, and finally degenerating into counter-revolution and fascism.

Bukharin, very early, fought the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the state and revolution; Lenin branded his position as "half anarchism."

Bukharin gave expression to his anarchistic views on the state and revolution in an article, signed *Nota Bene,* published in *The Youth International,* in 1916. He asserted that Marxism "must now more than ever emphasize its hostility to the state in principle," and that the task before it was that of "blowing up" the state.

Thus, Bukharin set himself against revolutionary Marxism. For Marxism is, axiomatically, not opposed to the state *per se,* but postulates the establishment of a new, transitional state power, the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat, which supplants the shattered state machinery of the bourgeoisie and creates the conditions for, and promotes the construction of, the socialist order.

In his notebooks on *Marxism and the State,* Lenin sharply criticized Bukharin's position, saying:

"What distinguishes us from the anarchists is (a) the use of the state *now* and (b) dur-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing the proletarian *revolution*. ('the dictatorship of the proletariat')—points of extreme and immediate importance in practice. (But it is these very points that Bukharin *forgot!*)"

Sbornik Sotzial-Demokrata, (Social Democrat Collection), of which Lenin was editor-in-chief, rejected an article by Bukharin expressing his anarchist views. After Lenin's death, however, Bukharin sought again to pervert the Leninist teaching on the state, by publishing the rejected article in the periodical *Revolyutsiya Prava (Revolution in Law)*, No. 1, 1925, with the following footnote:

"The reader will readily see that I did not commit the mistake that was attributed to me, because I distinctly saw the need for the dictatorship of the proletariat; on the other hand it will be seen from Ilyich's [Lenin's] note that he was wrong in his attitude towards the postulate of blowing up the state (the bourgeois state, of course) and confused this question with the question of the withering away of the dictatorship of the proletariat. . . . After studying the question, Ilyich arrived at the same conclusion about blowing up the state." (Quoted in Lenin's *Selected Works*, Vol. VII, Notes, p. 429.)

In flaying the Right opportunist faction, headed by Bukharin, at the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party, April, 1929, Comrade Stalin subjected to severe criticism Bukharin's non-Leninist theory of the state, thoroughly exposing it as semi-anarchistic, as meaning, in fact, that "the workers should emphasize their hostility in principle to the state as such, and, hence, to the state of the transition period, to the working class state." (*Leninism*, Vol. II, p. 146.) After dealing with the footnote referred to, Stalin said:

"[Bukharin] decided that henceforward, not Lenin, but he, *i.e.*, Comrade Bukharin, was to be regarded as the creator, or at least the inspirer, of the Marxian theory of the state. Hitherto we have regarded ourselves, and we continue to regard ourselves, as Leninists. But now it appears that both Lenin and we, his pupils, are Bukharinites. Rather funny, comrades. But what can we do when dealing with the puffed-up pretentiousness of Comrade Bukharin?" (*Ibid.*, p. 150.)

Bukharin's struggle against the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the state asserted and re-asserted itself through his entire later activity. From fighting the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state, Bukharin soon passed to fighting the proletarian state itself—the living embodiment of that theory.

Bukharin fought the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the peasantry and the revolutionary alliance of the classes.

At the Sixth Congress of the Bolshevik Party (August, 1917), the Congress which charted the road to the proletarian, socialist revolution, Stalin delivered the political report on the work of the Central Committee, Bukharin put forward an "independent" scheme. While not openly denying, like Rykov and Kamenev, the possibility of a proletarian revolution in Russia, he lined up with them, in effect, with his "theory" of two phases. According to this scheme, the first phase would be a peasant revolution, with which the workers' revolution would coincide. Then the second phase would begin—the desertion of the revolution by the now land-possessing peasantry, and the dependence of the proletarian revolution solely on the aid of the Western European workers—in essence the position taken by Trotsky. The imperialists, Bukharin claimed, had made a bloc with

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the peasantry—the entire peasantry, against the revolution. Stalin severely criticized Bukharin at the Sixth Congress of the Bolshevik Party, laughing out of court his "two phases" scheme, and driving to the very heart of the matter by his question: "But against whom is this revolution [of the proletariat that has already made its revolution] directed?"

And as for the bloc, against whom—Stalin asked—is it directed?

"Comrade Bukharin has not told us. This is a bloc of Allied and Russian capital, of the officers and the upper strata of the peasantry, represented by Socialist-Revolutionaries of the type of Chernov. This bloc has been formed at the expense of the lower strata of the peasantry, at the expense of the workers." (*Preparing for October*, Workers Library Publishers, p. 43.)

Bukharin's attitude to the peasantry was inextricably connected with his anti-Leninist presentation of the question of the state. Misrepresenting the nature of the state, he distorted the relation of the forces within it, and, of course, the strategy of the proletarian-peasant alliance arising from that relation of forces. His negative attitude to the state, also to the dictatorship of the proletariat, had to result in a negative attitude to the peasantry as a component force in the essence of the proletarian state and in its historic task of building socialism.

In the stand adopted by Bukharin at the Sixth Congress of the Party we can see the basic identity with the anti-Leninist, Trotskyite position on the peasantry. The counter-revolutionary outcome of this position will be discussed in the later section on socialist construction.

Bukharin fought Lenin's correct policy in regard to the Brest-Litovsk peace negotiations.

Proceeding from his anarchistic opposition to the proletarian state and his ingrained lack of faith in the Russian working class to maintain its revolutionary power and advance to socialism, Bukharin and his group of "Left Communists," resorted on the very morrow after October to organize blocking of the onward course of the revolution.

Thus, the factional organ of these "Lefts," *Kommunist*, put out by Bukharin and Pyatakov, stated in the second issue of 1918:

"Without depending on a European revolution, the Russian revolution would write its own death sentence. In our backward country it is impossible to realize socialism."

One of the earliest acts of this "Left Communist" disruption—the deep-going extent of which was then not known—was the struggle of Bukharin and Co., early in 1918, against Lenin's policy for negotiating peace with German imperialism, that was threatening to crush the young Soviet Republic. In a bloc with Pyatakov, Radek, and Trotsky, Bukharin conducted a vicious struggle against Lenin, seeking by the foulest means to disrupt the peace negotiations.

Bukharin and his group sought to turn the Soviets against Lenin by working hand in glove with the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries. Being in control of the Moscow and Petrograd Committees of the Party, they utilized their position for waging a furious, unprincipled struggle, which had the effect of delaying the negotiations. This delay was maneuvered by the Bukharin-led "Lefts" in opposition

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the view of Lenin and Stalin—confirmed by history—that immediate conclusion of peace with Germany was necessary, even on the harsh terms offered, to gain for the dictatorship of the proletariat a "respite" that would enable it to consolidate its power in preparation for the historic task of building socialism. When, on February 18, it was discovered, true to Lenin's prediction, and against the assurances of Bukharin to the contrary, that the Germans were advancing, the Central Committee, adopting Lenin's position, decided to renew negotiations. Five days later it accepted the German ultimatum, with Bukharin and three others voting against, and Trotsky and Krestinsky among those who abstained. In consequence of the sabotage of the Bukharin-Trotsky groups, the Soviet Union was compelled to accept terms far worse than those originally put forth by German imperialism.

The "Lefts" were bent on continuing their struggle against the line of Lenin. When they found themselves defeated, the "Left" members of the Central Committee, acting with characteristic indiscipline, immediately resigned from all their Soviet and Party posts, with the declaration that they "reserved the liberty to carry on agitation within the Party and outside of it." The Bukharin-controlled Moscow Regional Bureau of the Party adopted a resolution expressing "lack of confidence in the Central Committee" and concluding with the statement that "a split in the Party was hardly to be avoided in the near future." (Cited in Lenin's *Selected Works*, Vol. VII, p. 491.)

The criminal adventurism of these "Lefts" was evidenced by the Moscow Regional Bureau's further declaration, which foreshadowed their future betrayal:

"In the interests of the international revolution we consider it expedient to risk the possible loss of the Soviet power which has now become purely formal." * (*Ibid.*, p. 492.)

How starkly meaningful these words became in the light of the revelations brought out in the course of the trial twenty years later!

Exposing these criminal "Left" phrasemongers and charging them with playing into the hands of the imperialists, Lenin wrote:

"For, until the international socialist revolution breaks out, embraces several countries and is strong enough to overcome *international imperialism*, it is the bounden duty of the Socialists, who have conquered in one country (especially a backward one), not to accept battle against the giants of imperialism. Their duty is to try to avoid war, to wait until the conflicts between the imperialists weaken them *still more*, and bring the revolution in other countries still nearer. . . .

"But our 'Left' Communists—who are also fond of calling themselves 'proletarian' Communists, although there is very little that is proletarian about them and very much that is petty-bourgeois—are incapable of giving thought to the relation of forces, the calculation of the relation of forces . . . by their vacillation the 'Lefts' *are helping* the imperialists to provoke the Russian Soviet Republic into a clearly disadvantageous war; they *are helping* the imperialists to draw us into a snare." (*Ibid.*, pp. 354-355.)

And Lenin foretold the inevitable fate of these carriers of enemy class purposes:

* The testimony at the trial showed Bukharin to have been the author of the resolution here referred to. *Report of Court Proceedings in the Case of the Anti-Soviet "Bloc of Rights and Trotskyites,"* Moscow, 1938, p. 44.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The flaunting of high-sounding phrases is characteristic of the declassed petty-bourgeois intelligentsia. *The organized proletarian Communists will certainly punish this 'habit' with nothing less than derision and expulsion from all responsible posts.*" (*Ibid.*, p. 356. Our italics—*V.J.J.*)

Lenin did not then know what was to be fully revealed twenty years after, that, as the trial established, Bukharin had conspired in 1918 with Trotsky and the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries to arrest and kill Lenin, Stalin, and Sverdlov, with the intention of setting up a government of the Bukharinite-Left Socialist-Revolutionary bloc.

The one-time Left Socialist-Revolutionary leader, Karelin, examined in the office of the Procurator of the U.S.S.R., on February 19 and 20, 1938, gave the following testimony on the conspiratorial activities, in 1918, of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Bukharinites:

"On the instructions of the Central Committee of the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, the negotiations with the 'Left Communists' were conducted by Kamkov, Proshyan, and myself."

Karelin stated further:

"Bukharin proposed that we should not stop at the arrest of the government but bring about the physical extermination of the leaders of the Soviet power, and in the first place, of Lenin and Stalin." (*Report of Court Proceedings*, p. 29.)

It was during these revelations that what had appeared twenty years earlier as an "ideological" struggle on the part of the Bukharinite-Trotskyite factionalists in regard to the Brest-Litovsk negotiations had in reality been a sinister, organized attempt to wreck the negotiations as a means of overthrowing the Soviet government.

And now too we know that the assassination of the German Ambassador, Mirbach, in July, 1918, by Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, calculated to embroil the Soviet Union in a war with Germany, was carried through with the knowledge of the "Left Communists," who hoped to achieve through this what they had been balked of in the Brest-Litovsk settlement.

Bukharin fought the Lenin-Stalin policy of restoration.

The "Left Communists" opposed Lenin's theses *On the Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government* (April, 1918). They slandered the Leninist line of the Central Committee as being "Right opportunist," as being expressive of "the increasing declassing of the proletariat." They took the position that the alliance between the proletariat and poor peasantry (a fundamental of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the proletarian revolution) was leading the Soviet Power "into the channels of petty-bourgeois policy of a new type."

With the insolence of splitters they brought forward their notorious anti-Party Thesis 15:

"The proletarian Communists [sic!] define their attitude towards the majority of the Party as that of a Left wing of the Party and of the vanguard of the Russian proletariat, which preserves complete unity with the Party to the extent that the policy of the majority does not create an unavoidable split within the ranks of the proletariat itself."

And they followed this statement with the threat of "a businesslike and responsible proletarian opposition"!

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Lenin: *Selected Works,* Vol. VII, p. 508.)

Condemning their schismatic tactics, Lenin declared that their utterances "are a disgrace and imply the complete renunciation of Communism in practice, complete desertion to the camp of the petty bourgeoisie."

Again openly manifesting their opposition to the basic program of building socialism, the "Left" factionalists organized themselves to hinder the efforts of the proletarian state to advance the economy of the land to the requisites for socialist construction. They set themselves against the Party's policy of transition from confiscation to socialization; of control and accounting, of labor discipline and individual management, of the use of bourgeois specialists. Resorting as usual to "Left" phrasemongering, they charged Lenin and the Party with abandoning the "Commune State" for state capitalism.

Lenin refuted the demagoguery of these opponents of socialist construction, declaring

a. *As regards control and accounting:*

"Yesterday, the main task of the moment was, as determinedly as possible, to nationalize, confiscate, beat down, and crush the bourgeoisie, and break down sabotage. Today, only a blind man could fail to see that we have nationalized, confiscated, beaten down and broken down more than we have been able to *keep account of*. And the difference between socialization and simple confiscation lies precisely in the fact that confiscation can be carried out by means of 'determination' alone, without the ability to count up and distribute properly, *whereas socialization cannot be brought about without this ability.*"

b. *As regards the use of bourgeois specialists:*

"Is it not clear that the peculiar nature of the present situation creates the need for a peculiar type of 'buying off' which the workers should offer to the most cultured, the most skilled, the most capable organizers among the capitalists who are ready to enter the service of the Soviet government and to help honestly in organizing 'state' industry on the largest possible scale?"

c. *As regards state capitalism:*

"When the working class has learned how to defend the state system against small-owner anarchy, when it has learned to build up a great, nationwide state organization of production on state capitalist lines, it will have . . . all the trump cards in its hands, and the consolidation of socialism will be assured. . . .

"It is precisely because Russia cannot advance economically without traversing the ground *that is common* to state capitalism and to socialism (national accounting and control) that the attempt to frighten others as well as themselves with the bogey of 'evolution *towards* state capitalism' . . . is utter theoretical nonsense. To talk nonsense of this sort is to let one's thoughts wander *away from* the true road of 'evolution,' is to fail to understand what this road is. In practice it is equivalent to dragging back to small-owner capitalism." (*Ibid.,* pp. 359 to 370.)

The "Left" phrases of Bukharin and his faction in reality concealed their unceasing opposition to the consolidation of proletarian state power under the dictatorship of the proletariat: they therefore blurred the distinction between proletarian state and bourgeois state—in this way misrepresentating the phase of state capitalism under the proletarian state as bourgeois state capitalism. By their opposition to the leading role of the proletariat—since its hegemony without proletarian-peasant alliance is unthinkable—they essentially, as Lenin branded their activity, championed the resistance of an "enraged petty

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bourgeoisie" to the proletarian state control which is the necessary condition for the transition to socialism.

Small wonder, then, that in the course of this struggle the organ of the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, *Znamya Truda*,* was able to declare:

"The present position of our Party coincides with that of another trend in Bolshevism (Bukharin, Pokrovsky and others)."

And Lenin pointed to Bukharin's counter-revolutionary confreres:

"Therefore, while it is to Comrade Bukharin's credit that on the C.E.C. he 'felt ashamed' of the 'service' rendered him by Karelin [Left Socialist-Revolutionary, earlier referred to] and Ge [Anarchist], nevertheless, as far as the 'Left Communist' *trend* is concerned, the references to their political comrades-in-arms still serve as a serious warning." (*Selected Works*, Vol. VII, p. 372.)

Well might Lenin have put the words "felt ashamed" in quotation marks, since in 1918, Bukharin, in conjunction with the Menshevik Martov and the Anarchist Ge, came out with a vicious attack upon the decree issued by the Soviet government designed to put the railroad service in order through centralization of management. And well, too, might he have questioned the sincerity of that contrition when its avower was at that very moment in a complot with the camp of Karelin for the physical destruction of the very leaders of the Central Committee before whom he professed to feel ashamed!

Bukharin opposed to the Leninist analysis of imperialism the Menshevik theory of "Organized capitalism."

At the Eighth Party Congress, in March, 1919, Bukharin again tried to bring his opportunist views into the Party program.

He proposed to discard from the program the Marxist-Leninist analysis of the laws of motion of the capitalist system, its commodity economy and its recurring crises. He likewise sought to eliminate from the Party program all evaluations of pre-imperialist forms of economy, since he denied, together with Trotsky, the law of accelerated uneven development of capitalism in the imperialist epoch—from which position derived his denial of the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country alone—in actuality, for that matter, in any number of countries. He had in mind his own theory of "pure imperialism," according to which the principal contradictions of capitalism "disappear" in the era of imperialism insofar as the individual capitalist country is concerned—essentially, in other words, the Menshevik theory of "organized capitalism."

As far back as 1915, Bukharin had taken the position (in his work, *World Economy and Imperialism*), that the monopoly stage of capitalism transforms each "national economy" into a "union of unions," into a "state capitalist trust," within which competition is "reduced to a minimum" and the economic contradictions of capitalism tend to disappear, becoming transferred exclusively to the "arena of the world market."

In 1917 he declared:

"What was previously scattered and unorganized capitalism is replaced by *organized capitalism*." (*Spartak*, No. 2; quoted in *International Press Correspondence*, No. 9. 1938.)

In an article entitled "The

* *Banner of Labor*, in its issue of April 25, 1918.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Collapse of Capitalism," he wrote:

"Will this *new* type of capitalist relations destroy the contradictions in capitalist society? Will it destroy, first of all, the *anarchy* of the present-day method of production?"

To which he replied:

"If we limit ourselves only to the state organization, *i.e.*, the confines of a capitalist country, we can reply to this question in the affirmative." (*Spartak*, No. 10; cited place.)

Lenin, refuting Bukharin's position, said at the Eighth Party Congress:

"Pure imperialism, without the fundamental basis of capitalism, has never existed, nowhere exists, and never will exist. This is a wrong generalization of everything that was said of the syndicates, cartels, trusts, and finance capitalism, when finance capitalism was depicted as though it had none of the foundations of the old capitalism under it. . . .

"If the program were to be rewritten in the way Comrade Bukharin wanted, it would be a false program." (*Selected Works*, Vol. VIII, pp. 335-336.

Bukharin never surrendered this position, deriving from his eclectic method and his mechanical (*i.e.*, anti-dialectic, non-Marxian) materialism.

Thus, in 1929 he brought forward anew (*Pravda*, May 26 and June 30) his apologia for imperialism, by speaking of "the dying out of competition *within* each capitalist country"—denying thereby the general crisis of capitalism and advocating the possibility of planned capitalism without crises.

This notion of the possibility of overcoming the contradictions of capitalism by organization within imperialism, *i.e.*, the decaying stage of capitalism) paves the way for the ultra-reactionary "theories" of fascism, with its corporative state, its "elimination" of classes, its National-"Socialism." It furnishes an approach to the understanding of the "ideological" and subsequently practical affinity of Bukharin and Co. with the "Socialists" of the Third Reich.

History, however, soon made patent to everyone the treacherousness of this position. Bukharin's accommodation to imperialism was giving aid and comfort to all the Right opportunists and concealed anti-Party elements everywhere. In the United States, the unprincipled Lovestone faction, endeavoring to disarm the Communist Party and the American workers in the face of the great struggles to come, was predicting, in concert with all the imperialist apologists, a new, "victorian era" for American capitalism.

And it was in mid-1929, when all the apologists of Wall Street were singing hosannas to the health and long life of capitalist stabilization, that Comrade Stalin, basing himself on Lenin's scientific analysis of imperialism, made his declaration of great omen:

"The three millions now unemployed in America are the first swallows indicating the ripening of the economic crisis in America."

Before that year was over, the words of Stalin were a living reality.

The cleansing from the American Party of the Lovestoneite camp was a signal victory for the revolutionary principles of Lenin-Stalin over the traitor policies of the Bukharinite servitors of imperialism.

(*To be continued in the July issue*)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT

BY GENE DENNIS

A MISCONCEPTION regarding the democratic front which exists in some quarters is that the democratic front differs from the People's Front in that the first is projected today because it is considered that "at this time it is not yet possible to organize the existing broad democratic mass movement into a new political party" such as a national Farmer-Labor Party.

This is not entirely correct.

Only those to whom Marxism has become a dogma and not a guide to action would contend that the eventual form of the American People's Front *must* be that of a new political party. In this connection, Comrade Dimitroff, indicating at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International the path along which the People's Front in the United States might develop, stated:

> "Under American conditions the creation of a mass party of toilers, a workers' and farmers' party, might serve as such a suitable form. . . . "

Of course, the developing People's Front may eventually take the form of a national Farmer-Labor Party. On the other hand, it may take the form of a political federation, operating, insofar as electoral activity is concerned, chiefly through the Democratic Party primary, as the emerging People's Front and democratic front movement is already doing in a number of states, *e.g.*, Washington, Michigan and Pennsylvania. Or it may be crystallized organizationally through the medium of a People's Front pact or working agreement covering various forms of collaboration and joint activity around one, several or a whole series of anti-fascist demands and issues. In any case, it will not be only the organizational form that the anti-fascist movement will take which will determine when the democratic front has developed or grown into the People's Front. It will probably be this *and definitely, something more,* as we shall examine in a moment.

Another definition of the democratic front which is frequently heard is that while its "program is generally progressive" it is, however, "less clearly defined" than that of the People's Front. This conception is also inexact and is not fully confirmed by life.

For instance, among the demands and points brought forward today by various sections of the labor and progressive movement, ranging from general progressive New Deal leaders to the C.I.O. and further to the Left—demands which already furnish the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

program for the democratic front movement and the gathering democratic front—there are a number which are of a more advanced political character than those put forward by the progressives, including the Communists, for a proposed program for a Farmer-Labor Party in 1935-36. This is particularly true regarding such demands dealing with the struggle for peace, with the fight for curbing the powers of the monopolies, etc. This has taken place because of recent political developments, nationally and abroad, including the developing economic crisis, and the consequent growing political experiences of the working class and of all progressive forces.

Of course, it is true, as in the municipal elections in New York last November that the political demands and program binding the whole democratic front movement and ticket were less clear and defined than those which united the forces of the People's Front gathered around the American Labor Party, the main driving force in the democratic front. However, it would be a serious political mistake to draw a line of demarcation and difference between the democratic front and the People's Front simply and solely on the basis of "more clearly" or "less clearly defined demands." This would result in many cases in a distortion and watering down of the program and aims of the democratic front and in a subsequent weakening of the maturing anti-fascist People's Front.

* * *

The key to understanding the essence of the democratic front is to understand clearly its objectives and class content.

What is the chief objective of the democratic front? It is to gather together *all* progressive forces and movements "to defeat the offensive of finance capital and block the road to fascism in the conditions of the developing economic crisis."

What is the starting point and main content of democratic front? It is the organization of a *common front, embracing various forms of organization and activities,* sometimes more or less loosely knit together, to defend and extend existing democratic rights and liberties, to protect the most urgent and vital economic, political and cultural needs of the American working people, to safeguard American and world peace.

What are the class forces which go to make up the democratic front? These are the basic class forces which constitute the anti-fascist People's Front: the working class in a fighting alliance with the toiling farmers and city middle classes, rallying and mobilizing also important sections of the upper middle classes and certain liberal sections of the bourgeoisie. *For the democratic front, as it is developing and as it is projected, is the concrete application of the People's Front policy in the conditions of a rising democratic mass movement.* The democratic front is a democratic bloc of common action of all labor, progressive and democratic forces to fight against reaction and fascism, to maintain and extend democracy.

The draft resolution of our Central Committee for the Tenth National Convention points this out when it states:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

" . . . especially important from this viewpoint [building of the democratic front—*G.D.*] is the deepening struggle of the progressives against the reactionaries in the Democratic Party and the growing differentiation in the Republican Party, whose progressive sections are moving in the direction of a common democratic front. *These forces are drawn into closer collaboration with the growing independent organizations and political activities of the workers, farmers, middle classes and Negroes* [*i.e.*, with the forces of the People's Front—emphasis mine.—*G.D.*] . . . The broadening of the organized movement for peace, for aid to Spain and China, and the boycott of Japanese goods, the movement of the American Youth Congress to include all major youth organizations, the advance of the National Negro Congress to the position of a unified and chief spokesman of the Negro people—all these testify to the further broadening of the democratic front. . . ."

Some comrades ask, why did not our Party advance the slogan and tactic of the democratic front earlier? Clearly because the subjective as well as the objective conditions for this did not fully exist up until recently. For instance, among the new factors which have now entered into the political life and developments of our country, there are certain features and trends which have only matured on a big scale in the recent period, especially since the 1936 presidential election. Among these we must note the following:

1. The sweeping political realignments in the old parties which have been influenced by the rising labor, democratic and peace movement. Only in the course of and after the 1936 elections did this new trend in American politics assume mass proportions. What we witnessed at this time was the beginning of a broad realignment and crystallization of the progressive forces in the Democratic Party, and in certain places within the Republican Party, taking place simultaneously with the advance of the independent political organization and activities of the working class, expressed chiefly through the growth of the C.I.O. movement and Labor's Non-Partisan League. Moreover, a peculiarity of this development was that the growth of independent labor political action took place with the labor movement advancing in close collaboration with the progressive Roosevelt New Deal forces. While this development retarded organizationally the crystallization of a national People's Front, it extended the People's Front movement and helped create the present conditions which have made possible the organization of a broad, people's democratic front.

2. Closely bound up with this development is the fact that *the growth of political reaction and the increased menace of fascism in the United States*, and of fascist aggression and military intervention abroad, as well as the brutal offensive of monopoly capital to solve the crisis at the expense of the working masses, the small businessmen, as well as the independent sections of the bourgeoisie—served in the first place to strengthen and augment the anti-fascist sentiments and activities of the working class and the people. But also, these factors have served to alarm, arouse and activize important liberal sections of the bourgeoisie, represented by Roosevelt and the progressive wing in the Democratic Party. They have, at the present, served to influence these sections of the upper-middle classes and bourgeoisie to seek in their own interests

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some common front with the consistent anti-fascist sections of the people. with the workers and toiling farmers as well as city middle classes—*in order to oppose and restrict the unlimited power and the attacks of the most reactionary and fascist-minded sections of American finance captal.*

Thus, in the conditions of the sharpening struggle between democracy and fascism, between reaction and progress, the camp of progress and peace has been broadened and the conditions have been created for the forging of a powerful democratic front on an extremely wide and effective scale.

* * *

Concretely, then, what do we mean by the democratic front under American conditions "representing the beginning of the development of a real People's Front against reaction and fascism"? Here it will suffice to mention only three of several factors and considerations.

1. In the broadening of the democratic camp, in the extension of the democratic front movement for civil and trade union rights, for raising the purchasing power of the broadest sections of the people, for championing the cause of peace—*the forces of the People's Front, still as yet insufficiently organized, are rallied and mobilized on a wider scale than has been possible heretofore.* The working class, the toiling farmers and lower sections of the middle classes have obtained and are establishing greater freedom of activity and organization, as well as more powerful reserves in their struggle for jobs, security, democracy and peace. And on this basis there are being established more favorable conditions and the necessary prerequisites for establishing unity of political action for organized labor, for overcoming the split in the working class, and for bringing about greater collaboration and a fighting alliance between the working class and its natural allies —all of which is essential for the development of a real People's Front.

2. In connection with promoting and influencing the course of the progressive realignments in the two old parties in the direction of establishing a common democratic front with the organizations of the working class and people in general, and in connection with strengthening the collaboration between the labor movement and the progressive New Deal forces in particular, the following is taking place: Precisely as the Committee for Industrial Organization, Labor's Non-Partisan League, etc., have developed, strengthened and extended their independent activities and influence, the political realignments in the major parties have progressed. Likewise, simultaneous with the broader scope and movement of these progressive political realignments, labor's forces and organizations have been strengthened and become a more influential independent political factor. This is true regarding the C.I.O., the American Labor Party and Labor's Non-Partisan League. Also in relation to this, the working alliance between labor and its natural allies has begun to be improved, *i.e.,* the united legislative and election agreements between the C.I.O. and the Farmers Union, the close working relations between the C.I.O. and the National Negro Congress, etc.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3. Moreover, the dialectics of the class struggle and the anti-fascist movement are such that effectively, not to speak of completely, to realize the program and objectives of the democratic front—to struggle consistently against reaction and fascism, especially under the circumstances of sharpening struggles; it is and will be necessary for the basic and main forces of the democratic front, especially for the working class, to bear the chief brunt of the struggle, to unite and strengthen its own class organizations and to conduct on a wider scale independent activity. This is necessary in order to assure both the defense of the interests of the working class and people and the interests of the forces of democracy as a whole. Thus, under the very conditions of carrying out the program and achieving the objectives of the democratic front, the forces of the People's Front which are developing and being strengthened, will be further crystallized, politically and organizationally.

Therefore, it is clear that the democratic front is not a negation of the People's Front. Nor vice versa.

The democratic front under present conditions is the path to the establishment of the anti-fascist People's Front, is the policy to ensure the victory of democracy over fascism.

And the *key* to the success of both the democratic and People's Front remains *the achievement of working class unity* and the extension and consolidation of the independent activities and base of the economic and political organizations of the working class, operating in an ever firmer alliance with the toiling farmers and city middle classes.

Among the most urgent tasks confronting our Party and the entire labor and progressive movement in the practical application of the tactics of the people's and democratic front, are the following:

1. The democratic mass movement, which is growing on a local, state and national scale, is still inadequately organized. The problem of *gathering all* the forces of the democratic front, of *organizing* the democratic front, remains a central one. Likewise, the question of political initiative, of who will lead whom, yet remains to be definitely decided. What is essential is that the political activity and influence of the working class, of the C.I.O., of Labor's Non-Partisan League and the A. F. of L. Non-Partisan Political Leagues, of the A.L.P., etc., should be unified, strengthened and multiplied. This is not a question of a narrow struggle for organizational or political hegemony in the democratic front, but is a question of establishing on the basis of correct policies, activity and positive contributions—that political influence and direction which will best promote the welding together of an all-embracing front of all democratic forces.

2. All tendencies of Right opportunism, of neglecting and slurring over the independent role and tasks of the working class in the democratic front must be quickly overcome. Such Right manifestations as expressed in the labor movement in certain states, of relying upon the Democratic Party machine to nominate candidates and adopt an election platform (Alabama), of neglecting the democratic front

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

character of the election program in the scramble for securing the nomination of this or that candidate, and more serious, of "postponing" the building of Labor's Non-Partisan League until *after* the elections (certain tendencies in Illinois and Pennsylvania) must be brought to an end. This is important, not only for the welfare of the labor movement, but for ensuring the unfolding and developing of the full power and sweep of the democratic front movement against reaction and fascism.

3. But equally, if not more serious at the moment, than the liquidation of the existence of the Right opportunist tendencies, is the necessity of speedily eradicating all remnants of "Left" sectarianism in the application of the policy of the democratic front. We must wage a more consistent and uncompromising struggle against counter-revolutionary Trotskyism-Lovestoneism and its anti-united front, anti-democratic and People's Front policy. We must once and for all put an end to a prevalent narrow "labor" approach in many states and congressional districts to the selection of candidates and the scope of the election program. This means to overcome energetically all tendencies to underestimate the paramount urgency of establishing united labor political action between the C.I.O., the A. F. of L., the Railway Brotherhoods; between Communists and non-Communist workers—the foundation upon which the people's and democratic front can be built and be victorious. This means, further, more attention to such specific problems as:

a. In New York: Continuing the democratic front election policy pursued in the mayoralty campaign; establishing state and congressional democratic front election tickets and movements, broader than can as yet be built in support of the American Labor Party, such as will establish progressive unity of the A.L.P., C.I.O., and A. F. of L., the liberal Republicans and progressive Democrats solidly behind one progressive candidate for each elective office.

b. In California: Establishing correct working relations and an election agreement between the Federation for Political Unity, Labor's Non-Partisan League, the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. the Townsendite and Epic forces, on the one hand, the middle-of-the-road progressive forces in the Democratic Party who are now gathered around McAdoo.

c. In Washington: Broadening out the progressive movement around the Washington Commonwealth Federation, the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. and the Old Age Pension movement, to bring about friendly relations and practical collaboration between these forces and the centrist New Deal groups in the Democratic Party.

d. In Wisconsin: Uniting the main section of the labor, farm and liberal movement for concerted and collective activity within and through the Progressive Party and primary, for promoting proper working relations with the liberal New Deal Democrats in Milwaukee County, for establishing broader political unity of action of *all* genuine progressives to defeat reaction in the 1938 elections.

e. In building Labor's Non-Partisan League: While systematically pushing forward the growth and activities of the League, while further crystallizing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the independent political organization and actions of labor—the C.I.O., the A. F. of L., Railroad Brotherhoods, etc.—through and around the League, while giving more attention to involving the toiling farmers and city middle classes in L.N.P.L.—*to build around the League broader democratic front blocs and progressive coalitions.*

4. And finally, in building the democratic front, it is necessary to bear in mind that the tactics of the democratic front are by no means limited to questions of the coming elections, important as these are for the political future of America. In the sphere of broadening the peace movement, in the struggle for civil liberties and trade union rights, in the current fight for jobs and relief and in other fields, it is possible and imperative to explore the conditions for, and to effect, a broad democratic front of common action. It is possible and necessary *to unite the widest sections of the labor and democratic forces and organizations on each and every urgent economic, political and cultural issue and demand* that will arise, so as to rally and set in motion, not only the present active forces, but all the potential democratic forces which can be mobilized to help "defeat the offensive of finance capital and block the road to facism in the conditions of the developing economic crisis."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE I. W. O.— WORKERS' FRATERNALISM

BY MAX BEDACHT

FROM Saturday, April 23 to Saturday, April 30, six hundred delegates from lodges of the International Workers Order from all over the country met in convention in Pittsburgh. It was the Fourth National Convention of the Order. It rounded out eight years of existence of that organization.

The International Workers Order has to its credit a serious and successful effort to build a workers' fraternal order in America. The physical success of this effort is embodied in the membership and financial reports to the convention. In March, 1930, a little less than 5,000 people organized and chartered the I.W.O. Since then and up to April 1, 1938, these less than 5,000 have grown to 141,364 members. Table A. below, will illustrate this growth.

TABLE A

Date	*Adult Members*	*Junior Members*	*Total Membership*
Apr. 1, 1930	5,000	—	5,000
Dec. 31, 1930	9,057	—	9,057
Dec. 31, 1931	13,636	—	13,636
Dec. 31, 1932	20,746	—	20,746
Dec. 31, 1933	33,903	—	33,903
Dec. 31, 1934	52,575	9,578	62,153
Dec. 31, 1935	84,268	13,200	97,468
Dec. 31, 1936	97,851	18,556	116,407
Dec. 31, 1937	111,155	20,542	131,697
Apr. 1, 1938	119,913	21,451	141,364

TABLE B

Year	*Death Benefit Paid*	*Sick Benefit Paid*	*Junior Death Claims Paid*	*Total Benefit Paid*
1930	$ 1,800.00	$ 8,920.00	—	$ 10,720.00
1931	7,900.00	38,104.50	—	46,004.50
1932	33,318.40	86,678.72	—	119,997.12
1933	54,733.45	102,051.47	—	156,784.92
1934	72,834.14	132,425.26	$ 910.00	206,169.40
1935	114,929.11	185,520.53	630.00	301,079.64
1936	163,690.50	280,375.24	1,750.00	445,815.74
1937	247,344.81	358,293.86	2,520.00	608,158.67
Totals	$696,550.41	$1,192,369.58	$5,810.00	$1,894,729.99

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The financial transactions of the I.W.O. reflect its physical growth as indicated in Tables B and C.

TABLE C

RESERVE FUND ACCUMULATED

Dec. 31, 1930	$ 31,018.41
Dec. 31, 1931	60,444.70
Dec. 31, 1932	132,784.00
Dec. 31, 1933	479,906.31
Dec. 31, 1934	576,339.08
Dec. 31, 1935	857,665.28
Dec. 31, 1936	1,055,226.81
Dec. 31, 1937	1,243,512.01
Total Reserves Jan. 1, 1938	$1,243,512.01

These figures demonstrate the effective functioning of the International Workers Order as a benefit society. Its satisfactory service in this field is important. The securing of fraternal benefits is the very objective of the masses when they join fraternal benefit societies. The masses therefore rightfully judge the value of the organization by the quality and security of its benefits. However, these figures cannot tell the whole story of the growth and development of the I.W.O. It is a fraternal benefit society, to be sure, but not only that. Were it only that, it would become a deep mystery as to why it grew so rapidly at a time when practically all other fraternal societies lost members heavily, or at least stagnated completely.

The International Workers Order is not merely a benefit society, but also a social force working toward a greater economic security of the masses. Fraternal benefits can supply only an inadequate emergency help to its members when they are victimized by their economic insecurity. Any organization or movement which offers the masses to help them overcome their economic insecurity must go all the way in this help; it cannot confine itself to emergency measures only.

Of course, immediate financial help to members must be confined to emergency measures. It cannot be otherwise. The source of this help is the pocketbook of the members. If that pocketbook could supply more than emergency help, its owners would not suffer from economic insecurity. It is clear that a fundamental and radical solution of the problem of the economic insecurity of the masses is a social and political problem. Only the united efforts of society, exercised through its political action, can secure the necessary measures to wipe out economic insecurity for the toilers. This unchallengeable truth confronts a truly workers' fraternal organization with the duty not only to organize the securing of fraternal benefits among its members, but also to act as a social and political force for the establishment of full economic security for those who toil and for their dependents.

The report to the convention of the International Workers Order shows the manifold efforts of that organization to discharge this duty. The deliberations and the decisions of this convention provided plans for more effective efforts of the Order in this field.

It is these efforts of the Order that have made possible its rapid growth. These efforts have enthused the members and have spurred their desire to build the Order. They have at the same time popularized the Order

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

among the masses and spurred their desire to become members.

This growth of the International Workers Order is proof of the fact that for the toiling masses the problem of workers' fraternalism is on the order of the day. It is part of the problem of the building and strengthening of the labor movement.

The labor movement in the United States has advanced rapidly in recent years. This is due to, and in turn has caused, a phenomenal development of labor ideology and labor consciousness. The masses have started to think in political terms. Because of this the workers begin seeing the woods of the labor movement; they start valuing the individual organizations in their relationship to the whole movement. Guided by this better understanding, the International Workers Order has raised the question of the relationship of the fraternal organizations to the labor movement.

FRATERNAL MOVEMENT OFTEN A CONSERVATIVE FORCE

The fraternal movement in America was never much considered a workers' movement. Superficially viewed, it is not a workers' movement. However, it does have more people in its ranks than any other single movement in the country. Among these people there are millions of workers. The importance of this is intensified by the fact that the fraternal movement has always played a considerable role in the public life of the land. It has unfortunately very often acted as a brake on efforts for social legislation. Its inner life has always been and still is a powerful instrument for breeding and maintaining the capitalist ideology in the masses. In many instances corrupt political machines maintain their leaders in position through their influence on and control of fraternal lodges. Reactionaries often use their positions as leaders of fraternal organizations to give weight to their individual campaigns against the labor movement. During the general offensive of capital against labor and its organizations immediately after the crash of 1929, this misuse of fraternal organizations became especially evident. The leaders of one important fraternal organization offered their drill groups for vigilante duties against striking workers. Another large fraternal organization started at the time an intense "anti-Red" campaign, which in practice is a veritable anti-labor campaign.

Thus we see that in spite of the masses of workers in its ranks, the fraternal movement has in the past very often functioned as a conservative and even an anti-labor force in America; its composition, however, its development and its basic function make it material for a progressive force. To make it such a progressive force is the task of the militant section of labor in America. To take the initiative and to guide the execution of this task are the major mission of the I.W.O.

PREVAILING MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT FRATERNALISM

The reactionary role played by many leaders of fraternal organizations has created and nourished the idea that the whole fraternal move-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment is a "reactionary mass." Aside from being condemned as politically reactionary, it has also been poohpoohed as a mere business undertaking in the insurance field.

A close analysis of the fraternal movement will prove that both of these conceptions must be discarded as fundamentally wrong. Policies or tactics based on these conceptions are wrong. These conceptions are not based on an understanding of workers' needs and workers' interests.

The fraternal movement in the United States is not a uniform movement. The composition, the forms and the functions of the organizations in this movement are so varied that the common application of the term "fraternal movement" to all of its organizations and forms is in a sense a misleading expedient. It is certainly woefully insufficient as a guide for a realistic political approach.

The diverse bodies of the fraternal movement in America represent various phases of its development and function. Let us analyze the dynamics of this development.

Probably the oldest of the original fraternal organizations is the Masons. This organization had the most decisive influence on the forms and functions of the modern fraternal movement. The Masons did not have their origin in an urge for protective insurance. They sprang rather from political needs. The Masons grew to their original importance in the feudal days. In those faraway days they developed as an organization for the protection of the economic and political interests of Guild members. They became a sort of protective organization of the rising class of burghers. Through this organization the burghers, the handicraftsmen in the developing cities, endeavored to resist the pressure of the feudal lords. They started to fight aggressively for their own rule in the rising cities.

Only comparatively recently did fraternalism develop a practice of supplying insurance protection. This later transformation of the function of the more modern fraternal organizations also changed their composition. The originally exclusive bourgeois membership of this movement changed in the newer organization into a primarily proletarian one. Through all of these changes, however, the shells of its previous identities kept clinging to the body of the fraternal movement. That is why this modern instrument of insurance protection is still wrapped up in various remnants of medieval and mystic mummery.

FRATERNALISM ADOPTS MUTUAL INSURANCE FUNCTIONS

The first demand within the fraternal movement for instituting insurance protection came from the petty bourgeoisie. With the development of capitalism, the bourgeoisie became divided into a petty and a big bourgeoisie. After achieving political power, the bourgeoisie was taught by practical experience that the progress of a petty into a big bourgeois was not a natural and inevitable metamorphosis. It turned out to be quite an exceptional and rarely completed process. Of course, capitalist propaganda makes very much noise about the exceptional "success." At the same time it keeps persistently silent about

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the rule of the mass of failures. Especially does it keep silent about the evident fact that the one exceptional success necessarily causes the rule of the thousands of failure. Thus the noise about the exceptional success drowns out the groans caused by the thousands of failures.

The product of this miseducation is a political-optical illusion. The everyday rule of failures is transformed into the rare exception. The responsibility for the failure is then placed on the victims' shoulders and, of course, the capitalist system appears as the best possible and most beneficent social order.

However, this legerdemain changes nothing in the actual conditions of existence of the petty bourgeoisie. This existence was and is made ever more precarious by capitalist development. The petty bourgeoisie reacted to this by using fraternal organizations for cooperative efforts toward helping their members establish greater economic security. Thus the supplying of insurance became a function of the fraternal organizations.

CONDITIONS MAKE WORKERS DOMINANT IN FRATERNALS

Up to that period the dominant yearning of the petty bourgeois was toward becoming part of the big bourgeoisie and being accepted as an equal by the few big bourgeois above him. But before long he learned something new. He found a point of contact with the problems of the masses below. This new realization opened the doors of the fraternal movement to the toilers. Gradually this gave the fraternal movement the general character of a united effort of the poorer petty bourgeoisie with the working masses for the solution of a common economic problem.

The conditions which forced a reorientation of some old fraternals toward mutual aid also forced the working masses to turn toward fraternalism. Workers' mutual aid societies came into being. They patterned their forms and lives after the existing fraternal organizations. Some of the earlier of these societies became the forerunners of unions; others developed away from their proletarian base, at least ideologically, and retained nothing of their proletarian past but their worker-members and an indication in their names. In some cases the developing unions took over the functions of mutual aid. They maintained an existence half as unions and half as fraternal organizations. Experience proved, however, that most of the time the function of the one-half seriously interfered with the function of the other.

At any rate, aside from the influx of proletarian elements into the bourgeois fraternal movement, a definitely proletarian fraternal movement grew. But it remained proletarian only in composition. It never raised its own banner and its own program. It marched with the existing fraternal movement without making efforts to turn that movement into channels of service to the working masses. Instead, it made the working masses within that movement of service to the political objectives of its bourgeois leadership.

The founders of the International Workers Order recognized the fatal

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

weakness of workers' influence in the American fraternal movement. Therefore they raised the banner and formulated the program of a definite workers' purpose in fraternalism. They started organizing so that the working masses in the fraternal movement might assert themselves. They are working toward a condition and a time when the labor movement will claim the fraternal movement as its own. The need for this is obvious. The development of its basic function into a helper against insecurity has made the fraternal movement primarily a movement of the class of people to whom economic insecurity clings inseparably as a social inheritance. These people are the wage earners. They depend for their income on the wages realized from the sale of their labor power. But they have no control over the market of labor power. Therefore their income is extremely uncertain.

This insecurity of the existence of the toilers is not only a problem for the individuals of that class; it is a blight on society. It is clear, therefore, that the promise of the fraternal movement to help its members in case of economic need obligates it also to become a social force for the removal of this blight. It must become a force for the solution of the social problems of the toiling masses. To be such a force the fraternal organizations must approach all of their tasks, must orientate all of their functions from the standpoint of workers' needs.

The I.W.O. realizes fully that even in spite of this, the fraternal movement is not and cannot be purely a movement of workers. It is true, of course, that insecurity of existence is inseparable only from the members of the working class; but it transcends that class. It threatens groups in other classes as well. Poor farmers, small shopkeepers, little tradesmen, professionals, and other categories live under the shadow of this threat. Mutual help as practised by fraternalism is an effort at immediate emergency help to victims of this insecurity. The fraternal movement must appeal to all threatened victims. It must, therefore, have room in its ranks for all who need its help, no matter what their social class.

WHY DO FRATERNAL ORGANIZATIONS BELONG TO THE LABOR MOVEMENT?

If that is so, why should the fraternal movement claim a place in the family of the labor movement? Simply because the labor movement is the natural ally of the fraternal movement. It helps it to achieve greater economic security for its members. It will and can help in the exact degree to which the fraternal movement allies itself with the labor movement and helps it to achieve its objectives.

Concretely this means that a fraternal organization must make itself a factor in all efforts of the working class to destroy the germ of economic insecurity. It must help the workers to secure their existence by achieving greater job security; better and more abundant income from the job; greater security of health, limb and life on the job. It must therefore support the struggles of the workers and their unions in shops and industries. It must help the workers to organize unions. It must help them secure social legislation as a means of making

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their existence more secure. It must become a fighter for more effective public and social hygiene. It must help secure for the working masses and their children ever ready medical help. In short, it must be an ally of the workers and their organizations and an integral part of their movement in all of their economic and political efforts to reduce the threat of their economic insecurity.

The International Workers Order has from its inception accepted responsibility for functioning as a factor in all endeavors of the working class. It has worked toward an acceptance of this responsibility by the broader fraternal movement. It has demanded and is demanding now that the fraternal movement at long last acknowledge its development from outspoken organizations of the bourgeoisie into primarily proletarian organizations for protection against economic insecurity. It urges that the workers' fraternals take their place in the family of organizations battling for and serving the welfare of the working masses.

Lack of attention by militant labor has heretofore retarded and even prevented the organization and the exercise of proletarian influence in the fraternal movement. Because of this, though no longer primarily a bourgeois movement in composition and purpose, the fraternal movement is still predominantly bourgeois in ideological and political domination. The International Workers Order points out in one of the resolutions passed at its Fourth Convention that the hour demands and that the condition makes possible the ending of this anachronism.

PAST FAILURES OF PROGRESSIVE FRATERNALISM

Off and on in the history of the fraternal movement of the last half century there have been efforts to achieve the outward recognition of the changes wrought by the development of that movement. Thus, for instance, groups of Socialist workers attempted to build working class fraternal organizations. Their efforts, however, were not very effective. To be sure, some formidable organizations were built. But they did not influence the fraternal movement and its trend. Their conception was too narrow. They started out with the same abstract prejudices against the general fraternal movement that still characterize wide circles of militant labor. They considered this tremendous movement just one "reactionary mass." They failed in the important differentiation of the objectives of the masses in the fraternal movement and of the objectives of the small dominant groups in it. This failure made it impossible for them to design policies for drawing the millions of workers organized in the traditional fraternal organizations into the sphere of the labor movement.

The conception of these organizers of a new fraternal movement was narrow in another direction. Instead of trying to build a broad workers' fraternal movement, they confined their recruitment to adherents of one political creed. The result was inevitable —the new movement remained narrow, unable to gain influence among the working masses already organized in fraternals and equally unable to compete with the old fraternals in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their appeal to the masses still fraternally unorganized.

In spite of their professed radicalism these organizations have done little to mobilize their members for effective economic and political struggles. Instead of becoming an integral and active part of the labor movement they have confined themselves to platonic declarations of love for it. As the problems of the workers increased and their struggles became more intense, the leaders in some of these organizations have even decided not to allow the noise of these struggles to penetrate the privacy of their lodges or branches. On the theory that politics are a disturbing and disuniting factor and must be kept out of the organization, these leaders are refusing to unite their membership for effective action in their own interests. Thus, while demanding of the membership adherence to a prescribed political belief, they do not allow them collectively to indulge in political action.

These politics of reformist Socialism show their fundamental agreement with impotent and abstract petty-bourgeois liberalism. This reformism is always ready to profess in most verbose terms its love for democracy and freedom. But it is even more ready to prevent the masses from using their democratic rights and from using the privileges of their organized freedom to fight for the solution of their problems. It loves democracy as a museum piece to be exhibited to an admiring public. But it fears the masses in action. It dreads the thought that the masses might take the sword of democracy off the museum walls and use it for their own purposes and in their own interests. When reaction takes that sword off the museum walls to break it over its knees and throw the pieces into the faces of the masses, this reformism and liberalism has ready tears to shed. But there its efforts end. However, when the masses reach for that sword to use it in their own behalf, this liberalism and reformism becomes militant and fights. It fights against the masses, accompanied by the applause of reaction.

The history of numerous workers' fraternal organizations has proved that a policy based on such reformist fears and vacillations removes all possibilities of making the masses organized in them a social force in the solution of the very problems which they try to solve by joining. These problems are social problems. They cannot be successfully attacked by groups of individuals. They cannot be solved by voluntary financial efforts. The burden of their solution rests with society as a whole. The solution of these problems must therefore be made a task of the government. Consequently the efforts to solve these problems must necessarily become political efforts.

A NEW FRATERNALISM REQUIRED

Militant labor can bring the fraternal movement in line with the activities and aspirations of the labor movement if it approaches the problem politically. Such a political approach will show the way to fit the fraternal movement into its place as an auxiliary force for all efforts of the toiling masses to secure their economic existence. At the same time it will supply the means to make the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fraternal movement an independent force in the efforts for legislation protecting the existence, the health, the life and the limbs of the workers.

The International Workers Order is organizing the practice of this new fraternalism. It practices it within its own ranks. It propagates it within the larger fraternal movement. It solicits support for it from the labor movement in general. It works for a recognition in fact of the historic transformation of the fraternal movement from a bourgeois into a workers' movement.

The Fourth Convention of the Order, aside from registering its physical growth, demonstrated its growing successes in this field of endeavor. It accomplished what it did by building its own organization into a powerful model of a proletarian fraternal organization. At the same time it realized that this alone is not enough. Of course, some hundreds of thousands of new recruits join the fraternal movement yearly. The I.W.O. can attract a considerable part of them by functioning effectively as a workers' fraternal organization. But that effort alone would abandon the millions of toilers and progressives already organized in the fraternal movement. These masses must also be reached. The I.W.O., therefore, has never looked at its task merely as one of building a new fraternal organization. It recognizes its job to be the effecting of a change in the whole fraternal movement.

History has changed the material from which that movement is built, from exclusively bourgeois to predominantly proletarian. The action of militant labor must complete this process and change the political face of the fraternal movement. That movement has gradually risen higher and higher as a structure of labor designed to solve a problem of labor. But that structure remained standing within the sphere of organization, power, and interest of the enemies of labor. It is imperative that it be moved. It must be pushed out of the sphere of capitalist domination and influence into the sphere of labor, its organizations, its interests and its power. The I.W.O. takes responsibility for the initiative and organization of that big push.

Such a push requires action within the whole fraternal movement. It requires mobilization of the progressive and pro-labor forces in all fraternal organizations. In all of them action must be organized in support of labor's efforts to organize itself in the big industries, to achieve decent earning and working standards, to achieve more adequate protection through social legislation and to become a force in the political life and machinery of the land as the only fundamental guarantee for the protection of labor's interests.

A GREAT AIM—BUT WITHIN REACH

This job may seem gigantic. However, the forces willing and strong enough to carry through this job are already functioning. Even in such predominantly bourgeois organizations as the Masons outspoken progressive and pro-labor tendencies come to the fore. In a recent article written by a leading Mason in this country the activities of the Masons are critically reviewed. The writer complains that the Golden Rule is being

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

supplanted by the Rule of Gold as the guiding principle of the Masons:

"If the problems confronting the American people should become so acute as to threaten the stability of our developing democracy, a thing which has happened three times during the past 161 years, American Masons will be found fully prepared, as in the past, to contribute their share to the solution of those problems. Their mass action will be spontaneous and democratic and will be the result of pressure from below rather than of Grand Lodge edicts from above."

Another, a 32nd Degree Mason, writing about the opposition of leading bodies of the Masons to progressive ideas, complains:

"The real purposes of Masonry are subordinated to Big Business interests who do not want any reforms at all in the profit, wage slavery, competitive, capitalistic system under which we suffer."

Another leading Mason, commenting upon the growing lack of interest of the rank and file in the life and work of the organization, declares:

"Nothing is clearer to me than that the lack of interest of Masons in our organization is due to the fact that we are owned, body and soul, by a group of reactionary industrial and financial parasites who have constantly exploited the people and are using Masonry only for their own benefit."*

These examples of progressive thought and tendencies in traditional fraternal organizations can be multiplied. We quote from the Masons primarily because it is the oldest, the best known and traditionally the most conservative, because most definitely bourgeois, fraternal organization.

* These quotations are from a circular entitled, *Freemasonry and the Democratic Ideal,* by Newton Van Dalsem, Secretary of the Association of Liberal Freemasons in Los Angeles, California.

The study of the relationship of the fraternal to the labor movement made by the I.W.O. has made two things clear. First, those fraternal organizations which function as a helper against the economic insecurity of the men and women of the toiling masses belong to the family of the labor movement. In their endeavors they must become helpers and must be assured the help of all labor organizations. They must makes themselves part of the progressive forces which work for and achieve protective legislation for the workers. They must become a force in the organization of a united people's movement, the democratic front, building a bulwark for democracy and peace against reaction, fascism and war.

Second, the forces to accomplish this change are already present in these fraternal organizations. The working masses in them not only demand but also make possible the change of these organizations from conservative into progressive forces.

The experiences which the International Workers Order accumulated in its eight years of efforts and activities have also proved that many of the frills traditionally associated with old time fraternalism can very well be adapted to workers' needs and workers' uses. In this recognition, workers' fraternalism breaks with another "principle" of reformism. This reformism, while it contributed little or nothing toward the development of an effective mass fraternal movement of the toilers, pursued with blind hatred all outward forms of relationship of the old fraternal movement. A particular object of this hatred was ritualism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The ritualistic mummery and mysticism of the fraternal movement are inherited from its medieval predecessors. This mummery is an important reason why militant labor has always considered the fraternal movement with a generous measure of suspicion. This suspicion must be dropped. The problem of ritualism must be considered realistically.

The toiling masses are impelled into the fraternal movement by their own economic insecurity. They seek a solution of this major problem of their existence by securing the protective insurance of a fraternal organization. If the workers were to pursue their thoughts and desires for a solution of this problem, they would inevitably come to the conclusion that it is necessary to organize a political movement for the abolition of economic insecurity. Such a conclusion, which would benefit the masses, would not be beneficial to the beneficiaries of the economic insecurity of the masses.

A workers' fraternal movement must serve the masses and their interests by helping them to reach that conclusion. It must undertake to make its members a part of such a political movement. The aim of the anti-working class leaders in the fraternal movement, of course, lies in a different direction. They try to prevent the development of action by the masses against economic insecurity. Times have changed since the day of original fraternalism; the immediate functional purpose of the fraternal organization has changed. But the dominant political ideology of the traditional leaders of that movement remains the same. These leaders still consider it a fundamental duty of fraternalism to fight for the political dominance of the capitalist class. They use ritualism as a means to their end. They have designed it to subordinate the ideology, the thoughts, the desires and the dreams of the toilers to the dominance of the ideology of the ruling class. Through mystic ritualism they try to draw the members away from realistic thoughts. These thoughts might lead them to efforts to end their conditions of economic insecurity; instead, these leaders try to lead into the realm of imagination and illusions.

This function of ritualism is not at all inevitable and unchangeable. Nothing prevents the proletarian fraternal movement from utilizing ritualism for an entirely opposite purpose. It can adapt ritualism to its own aim of establishing a spirit of unity among its worker-members, of fostering a sense of responsibility toward each other, of generating solidarity actions and developing a fundamental workers' consciousness.

Of course, the question may be asked: why bother with ritualism at all? The answer is simple: bother with it because the masses have been influenced by capitalist education. The most outstanding achievement of this education is the maintenance of a mystic ignorance about the social forces which create the most puzzling, the most hurtful and therefore the most fundamental problems of the masses. An example will illustrate:

Capitalism teaches the worker that diligence, perseverance, willingness to work, speed in work and top productivity are the road to his success. When the worker follows this road,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he finds that it leads to overproduction. He loses his job. The very road which was to lead him to prosperity and economic security leads him to unemployment, hunger and misery. His capitalist teachings do not enable the worker to penetrate this mystery. Only Marxism can dissolve the fog of this "fetishism of commodities."

Is it any wonder, then, that so many retreat, if not consciously at least subconsciously, into the realm of mysticism? Even though they do it in vain, they seek the explanations there. This very natural fact is exploited by bourgeois ritualism. A proletarian ritualism would at one and the same time utilize this affinity for ritualism and attack it through rituals with a content and a purpose of their own.

An example of how a proletarian ritualism can serve the purposes of a workers' fraternal organization is demonstrated by the ritual adopted and carried through in one of the lodges of the I.W.O. in Philadelphia. The lodges operates in a Negro neighborhood. The candidates for membership are led into the room loaded down with a chain. Each links of the chain represents a basic problem of the Negroes: segregation, race prejudice, lynching, discrimination and so forth. During the initiation ceremonies the united efforts of the Order are figuratively applied to various sledgehammers representing unity, solidarity, political action, etc. With these hammers, impelled by the force of a mass united in the Order, the links of the chain are alternately smashed until the candidate is free. This signifies the absence of prejudices and segregation within the Order. The rest of the ceremony pledges the united efforts of the Order and of the candidate to smash these chains in the social structure of the community and the country.

A general basis of a proletarian ritual can be supplied by symbols representing the riches and the poverty that live side by side in our country. The ceremony must indicate that within the organization mutual solidarity helps the member to overcome the most serious sufferings, while the Order as a whole, in mutual solidarity with the working class, can help the masses as a whole to overcome this contrast by united action in the field of political and economic endeavors.

This and many other problems of workers' fraternalism were the subjects of the week's deliberation and work of the Fourth Convention of the I.W.O. The first years of existence of that organization represented a period of fruitful apprenticeship. The Fourth Convention and its work formulated and issued a certificate of craftmanship. A program of true workers' fraternalism has finally been crystallized. Experiences have helped select and sharpen the instruments with which this program can be put into effect. The I.W.O. will at once throw itself into its work. The experiences of the labor movement of the last ten years will surely secure for our Order the cooperation of the progressives and militants in the general fraternal and labor movement. With its program and with this cooperation, the International Workers Order is on the road to make the toiling masses in the American fraternal movement an integral part of and an effective force in the progressive and labor movement of the country.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MONOPOLIES, PRICES AND PROFITS

BY GEORGE BRAHMS

THE demand for opening a Congressional investigation into monopolistic practices was raised recently with renewed vigor by delegations of consumers' associations and trade unions in Washington.

It is the purpose of this article to elucidate these demands by an economic analysis.

The first thing which strikes one when looking at the entire economic set-up as it exists today is the combined effects of price rigidities and price disparities. These are merely two sides of the same picture which cannot be grasped unless monopoly as its central figure is taken into consideration.

The first task of the analysis, therefore, is to probe into the causes and effects of price rigidity of the monopolies. It is advisable for the sake of a clear exposition to distinguish between the monopolies in the basic industries and those in the consumption industries. The Draft Convention Resolution on the 1938 elections makes this distinction in formulating the slogans for the elections. The first slogan "Break the Sit-Down Strike of Big Capital" refers clearly to the monopolies in the basic industries; the fifth slogan "Break the Profiteering Monopolies Which Rob the People's Food Basket" to the monopolies in the consumption industries.

HOW MONOPOLISTIC PROFITS ARE CREATED

What are the main reasons for price rigidity in the basic industries? It is the high degree of concentration and centralization of capital, which means concretely a huge excess productive capacity on the one hand, and a bloated capital structure, a great amount of watered fictitious capital, on the other. Under such circumstances the monopolistic calculations will aim at exorbitant profits in order to maintain and carry through the huge excess producing capacity and the inflated capital structure. That means: Prices have to cover costs plus profits not only for that part of the plants which is being actually operated but likewise for that part which is unused. (This latter part was estimated by the Brookings Institution for the post-war period at 20 per cent on the average. According to the more correct calculations of Comrade Varga, it amounted to 50 per cent.) Nevertheless, the president of the American Iron and Steel Institute admitted openly that "normal" profits are achieved already at a 40 per cent operation of producing capacity in the steel industry. A similar rate of operation outside the sphere of monopolies would spell bankruptcy instead of resulting in high profits.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Over and above that, prices have to sustain the "legal title" of these economic royalists, their property rights, their vested interests.

The legal title to property in feudal times was the charter granted by the king. Nowadays, in the epoch of finance capital, it is still slips of paper, with the difference, however, that it is called stocks and bonds—having a distinct economic function. The ownership of this fictitious capital enables the finance oligarchy to control production and to a certain extent markets.

The realm of this control is enlarged by increasing from time to time the amount of stocks and bonds without a corresponding increase in plant equipment. (In the process of this "watering" of capital, the small owners of stocks and bonds, of course, are drowned). Thus, in high prices, the consumer has to pay also for the carrying through of this inflated capital, that is, of the maintenance and tightening of the economic stronghold of the finance oligarchy.

This control of production by ownership of large parts of fictitious capital becomes the chief weapon of competition in the hands of the finance capitalists. This method of competition, peculiar to the finance oligarchy, replaces the traditional way of "free competition," which meant simply underselling by lowering prices.

All of which serves to explain why those exorbitant profits cannot be obtained by price reductions. There is still another way of getting it clear.

The production volume of the monopolists is a much too large part of the total supply flowing to a given market. Yet the super-profit of the monopolies is nothing but the difference between the individual value of the products of the monopolists and their market price. By the most refined methods of rationalization, by the most hideous kinds of speed-up to increase the productivity and intensity of labor, the individual value of the monopoly products is being decreased. As the gap between this individual value and the market prices widens the monopolistic super-profits grow. Decreasing the value of products by increasing the productivity of labor is always dependent on the capitalist, provided he has sufficient capital; the market price, however, is dependent on the interaction of supply and demand. This holds true for "normal" capitalism. In monopoly capitalism, however, there is the further qualification that the market price itself is largely determined by the supply controlled by the monopolists, which constitutes the bulk of the total supply. Under such circumstances price reductions sufficient to stimulate additional demand would threaten the super-profits of the monopolists. For monopolies, however, super-profits are as vital a pre-condition for production as average profits for capitalists generally. And unless the monopolists are sure of their super-profits, they curtail production—they go on strike.

Precisely because the supply of the monopolies largely determines the market price (and this under the conditions of a stagnant or shrinking market on the one hand and excess producing capacity on the other) the only practicable device for keeping up super-profits is restricting produc-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion rather than reducing prices. During the crisis of 1929-33, the so-called independent steel concerns fared relatively better than the big concerns. The percentage of their active producing capacity was higher. The giant monopolists of the iron and steel industry complained repeatedly about the "cutthroat competition" to which they were subjected by the smaller companies. That was, of course, an "unhealthy" state of affairs; the mere fact that the "little" fellow could beat the big fellow by employing the traditional means of competition was unbearable to the latter. The giants stuck to their policy of closing down plants, restricting production and keeping prices high.

Their great capital strength, their possession of abundant cash and liquid resources enable the monopolies to withstand the pressure of piled-up inventories (unsold commodities). Selling inventories at a lower price would mean a considerable book loss.

Thus, the high level of inventories is—strange as it may seem—an incentive for the monopolists not to lower but to maintain prices. By this fact alone the crisis is deepened and accelerated. Therefore, as long as inventories are not reduced, prices are kept up by every means, and when inventories are approximately exhausted an upgrade movement starts from this same unchanged price level. Monopolies in the basic industries thus weather the storm which they themselves conjured up or intensify and prolong by their price policies. Price fluctuations are superseded by hectic fluctuation in production.

Monthly Extremes in the "Annalist" Index of Steel Production

	High	*Low*	*% Range*
1929	145.8	95.3	53
1930	111.1	61.1	82
1931	71.9	39.3	83
1932	39.4	22.2	77
1933	91.7	18.4	398
1934	78.7	34.7	127
1935	86.6	57.9	50
1936	121.7	66.8	82
1937	124.8	39.6	215

PARASITIC DESTINATIONS OF MONOPOLISTIC PROFITS

The tremendous amounts of super-profits serve to maintain the top-heavy financial structure which in turn necessitates these super-profits. Monopoly capital is insatiable; to the demands of the starving masses for employment and decent wages, it retorts with a much louder cry for increased profits. "You are still not starved out enough; I have still not enough profits. In such conditions I am not prepared to set the economic machine in motion!" This is the answer of the finance oligarchy.

To put it in economic terms: In normal capitalism, by far the biggest percentage of profits used to be accumulated, added to the original capital. In spite of the revolting luxury of the ruling class, the private consumption part of profits was only a rather small fraction of total profits. This was the time of capitalism on the upgrade. In decaying capitalism, matters are different. Only a tiny fraction of total profits is reinvested; the bulk of profits goes into gambling on the stock exchange, into financing the fascist gangs, into private luxury, or it is lying simply idle. The parasitism of the finance oligarchy is rampant.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In a publication of the Brookings Institution, *The Formation of Capital* (1935), this point emerges clearly. (The vulgar bourgeois economists of the Brookings Institution put it, of course, in a wholly inadequate and misleading terminology: they try to prove that the volume of new investments is not dependent on the volume of "savings" but rather on the prospects of the market):

"The investigation shows conclusively that money savings are not, under all circumstances, automatically transformed into actual capital equipment. For example, in the great prosperity period of the 'twenties, the proportion of the national income that was set aside for purpose of investment expanded rapidly, and the aggregate volume of funds rendered available to the capital markets in 1928 and in 1929 was in the neighborhood of 15 billion dollars. The amount of new plant and equipment which was constructed, however, was only a fraction of this amount." (*The Formation of Capital*, p. 15.)

The amount of capital not employed in actual production was used for the centralization of capital, buying up the weaker competitiors (as, for instance, in the case of the railroads, which since then never recovered from these transactions; their predicament is one of the chief obstacles now in halting or overcoming the present crisis). Besides that, these idle funds were led into the channels of speculation. In that way, a new problem arises: besides the problem of halting the falling rate of profit, the additional problem of maintaining the top-heavy financial structure by exacting from all other sectors of the economy and from the masses, interest and amortization for this bloated capitalization. That is why Roosevelt and Douglas insist on the "death sentence" on holding companies. It is, at the same time, easy to understand why the American finance oligarchy puts up such a determined fight, employing all means of sabotage, against these threats to their oppressive practices. Roosevelt and Douglas are right in seeing in these practices the immediate cause of the evils. This realization, however, requires consistent and unflagging attack and resistance against the economic Tories.

Net Productive Financing 1922-33 (in millions of dollars)

Year	*Net New Financing*	*Net Productive Financing*	*Net Productive Financing as Percentage of Net New Financing*
1922	3,568	2,721	76.3
1923	3,812	2,954	77.5
1924	4,521	3,466	76.2
1925	5,141	3,318	64.5
1926	5,208	3,168	60.8
1927	6,152	3,259	53.0
1928	6,682	2,947	44.1
1929	9,155	3,186	34.7
1930	6,068	3,446	57.2
1931	2,835	2,022	71.3
1932	1,148	702	61.1
1933	711	262	36.8

Source: *The Formation of Capital.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As can easily be seen from these data, the percentage of productive investments was incessantly diminishing since 1923. The remaining parts went into repurchase of securities, debt repayments, and other unproductive purposes, the result of which is the tightening of the control of finance capital.

The way in which the finance oligarchy got the entire economy in its grip, not in productive but rather in a parasitic manner, is depicted as follows:

"The results of the wide discrepancy between the amount of funds available for investment and the flotations of securities for the purpose of new capital construction were as follows: First the superabundant supply of funds available in the investment market encouraged and made possible the rapid growth of such business instrumentalities as the investment trust and the holding company. As the following table shows, these flotations aggregated more than two billion dollars in 1928 and almost four billions in 1929.

Year	*Investment Trusts*	*Public Utility Holding Companies*
1924	$ 44,400,000	$ 246,300,000
1925	208,500,000	401,900,000
1926	96,600,000	532,900,000
1927	418,700,000	883,500,000
1928	1,026,000,000	1,104,900,000
1929	2,951,000,000	1,039,000,000
1930	401,700,000	647,600,000

"The funds thus procured were employed almost entirely in the purchase of corporate securities already outstanding. Instead of adding to productive capital, these financial operations merely served to multiply the number of pieces of paper (shares of stock) constituting claims to the existing properties. Ordinarily such a diluting process might be expected to depreciate the value of each piece of paper outstanding but owing to the fact that the money was used to buy existing securities it served instead to boost their prices." (*The Formation of Capital*, p. 17.)

Alexander Sachs, in an article in the *Annalist*, January 14, 1938, tries to prove how the capital gains tax and the undistributed profits tax fetter new investment activities. Involuntarily, he proves quite a different point, that is, the fact that money capital is concentrated in the hands of a few monopolists who do not employ it for investment purposes.

"The distinctive feature of the present recession is, thus, that it is an under-investment recession."

A disproportionately large part of the available money capital is concentrated in the hands of the monopolists, who use only a fraction of these amounts of reinvestment by using it for carrying through their piled up inventories, and by obviating the transformation of money capital into functioning (productive) capital, are enforcing the maintenance of monopolistic prices and profits. The whole procedure is in some ways similar to the methods by which ground rent is appropriated or kept high by absentee landlords; there the trick consists in keeping out large parts of the land from cultivation, here by keeping large parts of money capital from flowing into productive channels. Parasitic finance oligarchy sabotages production.

In order to distract from the real issue the spokesmen of finance oligarchy started a shameless campaign against the Undistributed Profits Tax to cover up these practices. Let us take once more their own figures.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Corporate Net Income and Dividends (in millions of dollars)

	Net Income	*Index*	*Dividend Payments*	*Index*
1929	11,654	100	8,250	100
1930	6,429	55.2	8,202	96.3
1931	3,683	31.6	6,151	72.2
1932	2,153	18.5	3,885	45.6
1933	2,986	25.6	3,127	36.7
1934	4,275	36.7	4,889	57.4
1935	4,688	40.2	5,941	69.7
1936	—	—	8,581	100.7
1937	—	—	9,465	111.1

Source: *Conference Board Bulletin*, March 28, 1938.

With the sole exception of 1929, dividend payments exceeded net income greatly in all these years—and it was done, moreover, quite voluntarily, because at that time there was no Undistributed Profits Tax which they now decry as governmental interference and as the only reason why they do not reinvest their money for productive purposes.

All this clearly gives the lie to the lobbyists of American finance oligarchy, who persist in brazenly pretending that it is only the incidents of the undistributed profits tax and the capital gains tax which impel them to withhold their money from investments. This hue and cry ill behooves people whose profits according to the compilation of the National City Bank for 1,020 companies were by 8.5 per cent higher in 1937 than in 1936, in which year profits for 2,140 companies showed a gain of 47 per cent.

THE EFFECTS OF MONOPOLISTIC PRACTICES

Let us turn now to the *effects* of these monopolistic practices. In terms of *income* they bring about a shift of ever greater slices of the "value product," of new wealth from the masses, away to the monopolies. This additional income is used in a way which greatly strengthens in parasitic tendencies of American finance oligarchy. That means at the same time a further narrowing down of the market. The calamity of the railroads and the public utilities is well known. Their excess capacity and inflated capital structure are the decisive obstacles to new investments on these fields. Rate and fare reductions are out of question for the same reasons. The consumers pay, in the form of high prices, for the maintenance of unused capacity and inflated finance structure.

The consequence is that public utilities and railroads restrict their steel purchases and the consuming masses refrain from an additional use of these services. The economic exchange inside the capitalist class itself as well as the economic exchange between the capitalist class and the masses—these indispensable prerequisites of enlarged reproduction, of the continuity of economic life under capitalism—is curtailed to a stagnant minimum. The capitalist mechanism is clogged.

The same holds true for the two other great buyers of steel: automobile

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and building. The capitalists in the automobile and building industries cut down their steel purchases and the masses restrict their purchases of automobiles and homesteads.

Relation of Income to Purchasing Power for Automobiles

Income Class in Dollars	*All Spending Units (in thousands)*	
	1929	*1937 (A level 20% below 1929)*
0 to 500	3,701	5,000
500 to 1,000	6,319	7,100
1,000 to 1,500	10,020*	12,100*
1,500 to 2,000	7,782	9,200
2,000 to 2,500	17,802**	21,300**
	5,993	6,300
	3,812	2,600
2,500 to 3,000	2,247	1,650
3,000 to 3,500	1,604	1,250
3,500 to 4,000	1,091	800
4,000 to 4,500	785	500
4,500 to 5,000	565	350
5,000 to 6,000	736	540
Over 6,000	1,827	1,293
Potential car buyers	18,660	15,283
Grand Total	36,462	36,583

Source: *Future Markets for Automobiles*, Young Management Corp., New York City.

The building industry has to rely for its revival on the purchasing power of the lower income brackets. The periodical *The Banker and Financier*, February, 1938, states the case as follows:

"According to the National Housing Committee there is an unfilled demand for more than 2,000,000 dwelling units. But there is a wide gap between potential demand and financial capacity. Even in 1929, according to the Brookings Institution, 60 per cent of the families in the country received less than $2,000 a year, while the income of the typical family was about $1,700. The most reliable authorities allow about 20 per cent of the family budget for rent. For the typical family this would amount to $340 annually or about $28 a month. . . .

"According to a recent report by the National Housing Committee, it was estimated that about 89 per cent of the potential market is for houses costing less than $3,000 a unit and renting for $30 or less a month. Any extensive building program then, that disregards these elemental facts, is obviously doomed to disappointment.

"In order to bring the purchase of a house within the buying range of the typical family, costs would have to be reduced by about 25 to 30 per cent or else lower our housing standards . . ." (pp. 13-14).

The case for raising the income of these lowest income groups as the only possibility of getting out of the bog

* Number financially unfit for car ownership.

** Number financially unfit for new purchasing.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of economic stagnation is unchallengeable. Yet the newest developments in this field point to the opposite direction. According to the Labor Bureau's estimates and building construction permits issued in the whole country during January were slightly lower than in December. Yet the cost involved was higher by 15 per cent and was greater by 79 per cent than in January, 1937! At the same time the item of rents in the index of the cost of living went up!

Increased consumption of the services of public utilities and railroads, increased mass purchases of automobiles and homesteads, however, presuppose a rising standard of living. The lower the income, the higher the percentage represented by the food item in the family budget. Yet it is an established practice of the big food monopolists to charge extortionate prices for the lowest income groups. The calculation starts from the correct supposition that people with the lowest income are the ones who are most confined to the purchase of articles of pressing necessity and are compelled to pay any price for it. A Federal Trade Commission report, completed in 1937, reveals the following detail:

"The citizens of the nation's capital are forced to pay about thirty cents for a pound of veal while those in Little Rock pay fourteen cents.

"The difference in price does not mean that the packing companies have taken into consideration the comparative inability of the people of Little Rock to pay as much for their meat as the people of Washington. It means, rather, that Little Rock has the normal price and that Washington prices have been skyrocketed because the packers are aware that food budgets are more ample in that city then anywhere else. . . .

"The monopoly situation changes very little when the report leaves meat and turns to wheat. Little Rock, we mentioned before, pays the lowest price in the country for its meat. But Little Rock also pays the highest for its bread. Here again it is a case of charging what the traffic will bear. The people of Little Rock cannot afford to eat much meat but they cannot do without bread —food's first essential. Dieticians will tell you that the people who eat the least meat usually consume the most bread. The bread trust has taken advantage of this knowledge to impose the highest bread prices in the country on the city which can least afford to pay." (*Current History*, February, 1938.)

Incidentally, that report of the Federal Trade Commission was never printed. The scandalous affair is worth mentioning. The lobbyists of the four giant food trusts succeeded in obstructing the publication of the results of these investigations which tell a devastating story of their criminal practices. Exorbitant profits and extortionate prices of the food monopolies are being made possible solely by their special position standing between the scattered masses of small farmers on the one side and consumers on the other. Low prices paid to the farmer, high prices exacted from the consumer, this is the practice of the food monopolies. Price rigidities and price disparities are two aspects of the same practice conspiring to depress the income of the masses and swell the income of the monopolists.

Price disparities are a direct consequence of price rigidities. It is necessary to distinguish here between what is a primary cause and what is a secondary effect. Low prices for the products of the farmers and high prices for the products of the monopolies, this is one of the most important price disparities. Yet every attempt at resolving

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this disparity which aims *only* at raising the low price level for agricultural products and not *at the same time* at forcing down monopolistic prices, would be in the long run doomed to failure. The decisive link of the chain is the price rigidity of the monopolies. To grasp it firmly means raising the income of the farmers *and* of the masses of city consumers. This realization is the basis for the common fight of farmers and workers against Public Enemy No. 1: monopolistic capital.

Year	*Farm value*	*Retail value*	*Margin*	*Farm value as per cent of retail-value*
1929	$195	$415	$213	47
1932	88	270	182	33
1936	152	342	190	44
1937	161	356	195	45

Source: *Facts Relating to the Agricultural Situation in 1938*, by L. H. Bean, Jan., 1938.

FOR INTENSIFIED STRUGGLE AGAINST THE FINANCE OLIGARCHY

The misery of the masses of the farmers and of the city consumers is the soil on which the surplus profits of the monopolies thrive. It is at once the precondition and effect of these surplus profits. Therefore the fight of the masses for alleviating their misery challenges the unbridled supremacy of the parasitic finance oligarchy. *The main slogan of the democratic front as formulated by the Communist Party "For democracy, security, jobs and peace" means that every success won in the fight for better living conditions for the American people is at the same time a battle won for peace and democracy. It is only in this struggle that the emergence and rise of fascism in America can be effectively combatted.*

Drain the soil on which parasitic finance oligarchy thrives, the misery of the masses—it is by that means only that fascism in America can be nipped in the bud.

The program of the Communist Party for the democratic front is a rallying point around which the masses of farmers, workers and the middle classes in the cities can be mobilized and the struggle for peace and democracy organized.

In the fight for jobs or adequate relief for every worker, for the enforcement of the law for collective bargaining upon the open-shop employers, for the adoption of the wages and hours bill, for the improvement and extension of the social security law, for better prices for the farmers and guaranteeing the possession of their land, the fascist and war-making plans of the finance oligarchy will fail.

The outcome of this struggle will decide whether America will emerge from the chaos of this crisis with a rising standard of living for the masses and with reinforced and strengthened democracy or with enhanced economic power for the monopolies and destruction of democracy by the reactionaries. The choice of every progressive man and woman cannot be in doubt. The American people will give the first answer in the coming Congressional elections.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CAMPAIGN FOR THE FEDERAL ARTS BILL

BY C. S. MARIN

IN GREETING the Second National American Writers Congress in June, 1937, Comrade Browder spoke not only for the Communist Party but also expressed the thoughts of the broad masses of the democratic front of today when he said:

"We [Communists and writers] are united in our determination to defend culture, to unite culture with the strivings of the people, to preserve and extend our democratic heritage, to assist our brothers in other lands who are suffering the bestial attacks of fascism. Above all, we are united in the firm determination that world fascism, and its expression within our land, shall never come to power in the United States."

Let us remember that it is not in the spirit of idle exercise that fascist reaction has burned the books produced by some of the noblest minds of Western Europe; persecuted and driven to suicide the scientists of Vienna; exiled and hounded writers, musicians, painters, actors and directors. Fascism recognizes its enemies, seizing and destroying, among the first, all evidence of true enlightenment, setting up in its place a sham facade of barbaric verbosity through which it attempts to dazzle the people. Despite the efforts of sections of the American press to represent Herr Hitler as a painter of pictures, it is most likely that he will be remembered only as a murderer and a vandal. The motto of fascism will for all time be remembered through the words of the Nazi chieftain: "When I hear the word culture, I reach for my revolver."

The cultural workers of America are the indispensable allies of the broad masses of the people in the struggle against reaction; in the fight for democratic rights, security, jobs and peace. Our Party recognized as one of its important tasks to defend culture and to win the cultural movement for the democratic front.

To accomplish this, it is not sufficient to give our support to those forces for progress within the cultural movement itself which are represented by the youngest and most vitally creative section of that movement. We must mobilize the strength of the entire democratic front in support of cultural progress which is now fighting to end the economic, social, and artistic isolation of the cultural movement from the people. This is a program to establish the rights of creative workers to live and to produce their work with the assurance of reasonable remuneration based upon the social use of their work, to establish *people's sponsorship, enjoyment* and *participation*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the arts as a principle of our democracy.

In short, this is a campaign to enact the principles of the Federal Arts Bills —the Pepper-Coffee Bill, and, more recently, the bill unanimously recommended by the Sub-Committee on Patents, of which Congressman Sirovich is chairman.

In the following Declaration of Policy in the Pepper-Coffee Bill, the broad outlines of the problem are drawn and the essential principles of a democratic system of public sponsorship of the arts set forth:

A BILL

To provide for a permanent Bureau of Fine Arts

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Section 1. The Federal art projects [of the W.P.A.] have proven conclusively that there exist in the United States the potentialities for a great and flourishing culture, which will, if properly developed, make our country a greater Nation, and render upon our people as a whole the occasion to exercise with democratic equity their cultural aspirations.

During the entire history of our Nation and up to the time of the creation of these projects, the arts were the jealously guarded possessions of the few and were not made available to the majority. Works of art were confined to privately incorporated museums, difficult to visit, and to the completely inaccessible and private collections of wealthy patrons. Greast music was played by only a few orchestras in the largest cities at prices prohibitive to the average person. The American theater was confined to the center of New York City and it is still true that there exists no theater in most sections of the country. The enjoyment of culture has, in the country's past, been predicated too much upon the ability of the individual to pay.

Through the inception of the Federal art projects these conditions have undergone material changes which have brought into the cultural life of the Nation democratic implications and practices never before known. For the first time millions of our people have begun to receive benefits of cultural enlightenment beyond an elementary education.

The arts have been decentralized through Federal patronage. They have been extended and made available to the entire country. Mural paintings depicting significant and stirring events in American history and present-day life have not only made schools and other public buildings more beautiful but of greater community interest. Millions of people have attended the theater in their own community where heretofore none had existed. Outdoor theaters have come to the parks, squares, and to the countryside. Orchestras now play in rural communities, and in the cities outdoor concerts are held in the parks during the summer. In the playgrounds there are now all manner and types of classes for children in the arts, crafts, and puppet theaters. These have proved to be a great deterrent to juvenile delinquency. Opportunities for musical education, vocal and instrumental, are widespread and extremely popular. The folk art of America, an integral part of our earlier national life, has again received encouragement. The fine contributions of the Negro people in this field and the continued practice of traditional forms of folk art in various isolated communities have been brought to light and aided materially. Art galleries have been established and maintained in rural sections. These galleries have become centers of community interest, thus nurturing an indigenous growth and direction for culture of invaluable import for the Nation as a whole.

The above only indicates the beginning of a direction which shall be reaffirmed and extended. It merely points the way of fruition for a democratic culture for the United States.

It is no longer consistent with the purposes of democratic government to render this program subject to the limitations of the present work-relief program. Under this present program it has been impossible to establish reasonable tenure and therefore there is required a constant revision of plans and operations due to the emergency character of these appropriations.

The personnel employed upon the projects cannot work to the best of their creative ability while subject to momentary dismissal and while under the knowledge that, at any

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time, the public which they serve may be deprived of the benefits of the cultural services of the projects as a whole, and the Nation not granted the assurance of permanency of development for its culture. To accomplish this, there is needed a long-range and adequate plan.

It is the obligation of the Government to recognize that culture as represented by the arts is a social necessity consistent with democracy and also to recognize that such culture must be encouraged and developed in the interest of the general welfare.

It is therefore the declared policy of the Government of the United States that Congress appropriate funds out of the United States Treasury for the establishment and support of a permanent Bureau of Fine Arts.

The Sirovich sub-committee bill, which will soon be considered by the full Patents Committee in the House of Representatives, seeks to create a Bureau of Fine Arts in the Department of the Interior. This legislation incorporates the fundamental features of the Pepper-Coffee Bill with several important changes in detail. It eliminates some of the provisions which were criticized even by persons who are in accord with the general principles involved. The provision most frequently attacked in the Pepper-Coffee Bill is that which provides for the appointment of the Commissioner of Fine Arts by the President from a panel of names submitted to him by artists' organizations representing the greatest number of artists employed by the Bureau. Opponents of this section have complained that its application would limit representation to only a few organizations. In order to satisfy this criticism, and for the purpose of achieving the greatest possible unity, the Arts Unions Conference, comprised of the major trade unions in the theatrical, music, art and writing fields, has suggested that all references to panels be taken out of the bill. The Sirovich sub-committee bill eliminates all references to panels and leaves the appointment of the Commissioner to the President without restriction of any kind. Thus the new bill opens the way for even broader support than heretofore.

A serious criticism of this new bill must be made. It contains the provision that only American citizens or those who have declared intention of becoming citizens within two years previous to employment shall be eligible under the act. One effect of this provision would be to eliminate Chinese and Japanese artists who under our statutes are ineligible for citizenship. Other foreign-born artists would be similarly affected. This clause reflects reactionary pressure and is inconsistent with the general spirit of the bill and with the recent statements of President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull regarding the right of asylum in the United States for victims of persecution in fascist countries.

As in the case of our economic life, generally, the monopolists and their apologists who are sabotaging every attempt toward recovery, demagogically attempt also in the sphere of the cultural professions to absolve themselves from guilt for the crisis by shifting the blame onto the artists themselves. They try to do this by creating a breach between foreign-born and native workers in the cultural professions. This demagogic argument must constantly be exposed as being against the interests of all workers and professionals. Foreign-born artists should not be deprived of the right to earn a livelihood or to continue

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their invaluable cultural contributions to our national life. Therefore, while supporting this bill, we must make every effort to have this section deleted.

What is the record of the public accomplishments of the W.P.A. Arts Projects upon which this historical enunciation is based?

For the Federal Theater: An audience of 25,000,000 people, 65 per cent of whom have never before seen a play with living actors. The establishment of operating theater companies in 22 states of the nation; the revival of the best classics of the world; the setting up of a theater of entertainment, circuses, musical comedies, light opera, marionettes, using the talents of vaudevillists for revues based upon topics of the day; the development of special theaters for children and youth; the bringing out, as no commercial producer has ever been able to do, of a tremendous cycle of American plays dealing with the great periods and men of our national history: the development of a number of Negro theaters; and, last and perhaps most outstanding, *The Living Newspaper*, dealing with major social problems of our day in an invigorating way: agriculture in *Triple A Ploughed Under*, labor and the courts in *Injunction Granted*, housing in *One Third of a Nation*.

The progressive social content of so many of the productions of the Federal Theater, and their vigorous and original dramatic presentation, are due admittedly to the contributions of those cultural workers who are, in every respect, close to the working class.

For the Federal Art Project: the allocation of works of art to 11,325 tax-supported public institutions all over the country in the following numbers: 95,570 paintings, sculptures, murals, etc.; 349,943 posters, mostly on public campaigns for safety and health; 39,692 arts and crafts projects, visual aids, etc.—making a grand total of 774,467 works allocated to public institutions in two and a half years. This production of work is taking place in all regions of the country and, in addition, an audience of approximately 11,000,000 people have been reached through Project exhibitions and teaching activities.

Lastly, no less than fifty community art centers have been established, mainly in the South, West, and Middle West, through which two and a half millions have participated in local art programs. These centers for the most part are in backward areas, barren of any cultural activity and unaware of their own traditions and potentialities. The teaching activities of the Art Project have been recognized by educators and social workers as great factors in the prevention of juvenile delinquency and in the correction of mental and physical disabilities.

For the Federal Music Project: In 26 months an audience of 92,000,000 heard 131,000 programs and performances; the present enrollment of 125,528 students in music classes; the organization in 273 cities, counties, and townships in 42 states of 40 symphony orchestras, 87 concert orchestras, 69 bands, 52 dance orchestras, 11 opera units, 19 choral groups, and 13 projects for copyists, arrangers, and librarians; performances in cities from coast to coast, ranging from Fort

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Worth, Texas, to Superior, Wisconsin, from Boston to Santa Barbara, California.

For the Federal Writers Project: the institution of a gigantic series of American guide books, covering every nook and corner of the country, describing the American scene in full and local detail. When completed this series will run to 20,000,000 words and will serve to acquaint Americans with many important aspects of their country. Up to the present, approximately 150 separate items have been published, 50 of which are of major character. In addition to this, the Writers Project is furnishing services to other divisions of the W.P.A. and to public agencies.*

On the basis of this record it is easy to understand the statement of Lewis Mumford, eminent critic and student of our national culture, who said in an open letter to President Roosevelt, December 30, 1936:

> "There has never been a place in our present system for the artist, except as a flatterer of the rich and idle, or as a mere servant of business enterprise. If the artist is effectually to serve his community, he cannot depend upon the private patron. Now that the community itself has devised appropriate ways [*W.P.A. Arts Projects*] for patronizing and encouraging the arts and giving them a permanent public home, it is time that art be taken for what it is—a realm like education which requires active and constant public support. The discovery of art as a vital factor in contemporary American culture was not, of course, the original intention of the W.P.A. art projects. But the fact is that the discovery has now been made; and it would be blind, perhaps even perverse, to ignore its implications. . . . The worth of the W.P.A. arts projects has been proved: a magnificent achievement. Now is the time, not to tear down the scantling, but to build the permanent structure."

And in referring directly to the Pepper-Coffee Bill, Mr. Olin Downes, music critic of *The New York Times*, although opposing the bill as unsatisfactory in its legal details, had the following to say:

> "This . . . bill has an admirable preamble, to which few forward-looking artists or citizens who look to the cultural as well as the economic welfare of the American people would fail, in principle, to subscribe."

However, in considering a program dealing with the economic, social, and cultural conditions of a section of our population which the Communist Party has always considered of great importance, particularly with regard to its relation to the democratic front, approbation of the general ideas of this program from a few critics of the arts is not sufficient, no matter how keen or sensitive to public trends these may be.

THE CAMPAIGN FOR THE FEDERAL ARTS BILLS

The nine-month campaign for this legislation has proved that its fundamental principles constitute a reasonable and practical formulation for permanent government sponsorship of the arts. This is evident despite the quibbles over the detailed provisions and phrasing.

Aside from its validity as a measure going far to meet the economic and cultural problems of the creative workers, and to create conditions of production and sponsorship of art which are basically public and democratic in character, we must ask if this program is correct from the viewpoint of the need of establishing practical and

*All figures derived from official reports.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

working unity within the cultural movement as a prerequisite for the full participation of that movement in the progressive and democratic front.

The answer is yes. For the first time in the history of our country a basic issue has been projected clearly and decisively within the cultural movement. Two camps are defined: those who are for government sponsorship of the arts and those who are against. Majority opinion in the field, represented not only by prominent progressive individuals but chiefly through organizations, is clearly in sympathy with the principles, although not in all cases with the details of the legislation. Polls taken in a number of centers, chiefly Cincinnati and Cleveland, where differences on details have been very sharp, indicate overwhelming support of the general principles that ensure democratic function of such a program in the interests of the people. Within the organizations of cultural workers, the Federal Arts Bill has become the main issue, with the progressive forces carrying the day in most cases.

In the trade union field, all unions with memberships employed on the arts projects in New York City, with the single exception of the stage hands, were brought together for the first time on this issue. They formed a conference, including twenty-five A. F. of L., C.I.O., independent unions and Workers Alliance organizations, which has fought, not only for the Pepper-Coffee Bill, as amended by this conference, but likewise for the enactment of the general recovery program and the preservation of the present projects. Through the mass meetings of this conference the memberships of Actors Equity, Musicians Local 802, United Scenic Artists—all A. F. of L., of the United American Artists, the Newspaper Guild, the United Federal Workers—C.I.O., and the Workers Alliance, are learning the practical and invaluable lessons of unity in action in defense of their right to work and to make a contribution to the cultural life of our country.

From the Harlem Artists Guild to the Southern Printmakers, from the Duchess County Artists Association in New York to the Jewish Art Club of Cincinnati, from the National Society of Mural Painters to the Screen Actors Guild of Hollywood, endorsements are coming. A definite direction for the cultural movement in America has been presented and the majority of American creative workers from coast to coast are agreed upon the main outlines of the road to be travelled.

The reactionaries within the cultural movement have had their hand forced by this issue. They have had to say that art is aristocratic, not democratic, or resort to the argument that the bill is "a desperate attempt to continue relief activities and provide a living in the fields of art mainly for those who . . . would like to go on free from competitive conditions."

They have invoked the shades of totalitarianism. "As a permanent set up . . . the proposal introduces a certain totalitarian concept of federal functions incompatible with the free enterprise which has heretofore been the particular genius of our democracy."*

And finally these gentlemen of the

*From a brochure issued by the Fine Arts Federation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

National Academy, *et al.*, after draping themselves in the American flag in the manner and language of the Liberty League, usurp for themselves the custody of the cultural future of our country by leveling charges of mediocrity at any and all supporters of a democratic art. Their ideological and social bankruptcy is apparent; their woeful failure to win public support for their position has been clear from the beginning of the campaign.

THE PROGRAM AMONG THE PEOPLE

Broad masses of the people are supporting the legislation. Within the trade union movement, the Atlantic City Conference of the C.I.O. last October gave the signal to the entire progressive movement by endorsing the general activity of the Arts and Adult Educational Divisions of the W.P.A. and urging the permanent establishment of their activity as a legitimate function of democratic government in the interest of the people. This endorsement and the consequent incorporation of government sponsorship of the arts as a vital part of the legislative program of Labor's Non-Partisan League is the continuation in our century of the conscious fight which the labor movement of the 1820's and 30's instigated and led in behalf of our free and public system of education.

E. L. Oliver, Executive Secretary of Labor's Non-Partisan League, in testifying before a House of Representatives Committee considering this legislation, expressed the view of all labor and its allies as follows:

". . . from the standpoint not alone of labor, and its allies but of the entire progressive and liberal group in the United States, I feel that this legislation is of tremendous significance. . . . It will not only fill a very important part in the general program of directly correcting our unemployment situation, but it will also have a profound cultural significance. From both of these standpoints, labor and the progressives should be interested in the adoption of this legislation."

In the American Federation of Labor, support for the bill has been secured wherever the progressives are active and aware of the issue. It is important to note the practically unanimous support from the crafts in the theatrical and amusement industry, the participation of the American Federation of Musicians and most of its locals, and the serious interest of the American Federation of Teachers, as well as a considerable list of both C.I.O. and A. F. of L. international and local unions and a number of city and state bodies.

On the political field, endorsements of the Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota, the Commonwealth Federation of Washington, the activity of the American Labor Party City Councilman Hollander in New York in behalf of the present projects and the program, practically cover the most important phases of the movement. In the words of Governor Benson of Minnesota, given to the press on February 24, 1938:

"If passed, the Federal Arts Bill may well be the turning point for progressive development in the history of American culture. That is why I am glad to join with those who are requesting the passage of such a measure by the present Congress."

Space limitations allow mention of only one more major participant in the movement, the National Negro Congress, representing the broadest

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

section of the Negro people. Through this program for a democratic culture, we must bring forward in the sharpest manner the glorious contributions of the Negro people to the cultural traditions of our country. This program must be utilized by our Party to break down further the system of super-exploitation of the Negro people, to establish their right to participate in and enjoy the fruits of our culture on an equal basis, to end once and for all the patronizing condescension hitherto extended to them in their cultural activities, and to establish not only their rights but their special abilities in this field of public life.

Finally, it must be noted that Federal Arts Committees, organized on the basis of broad community and representative support, have been established in approximately thirty major communities in all sections of the country. These committees have gained the support of middle class professional and working class groups as well as that of the cultural organizations. Working under the leadership of the National Federal Arts Committee in New York City, these organizations have sufficient accomplishments to their credit to indicate the unlimited possibilities of extending an understanding of a program for government sponsorship of the arts among organizations of all kinds and directly among the people in the various communities.

WHAT ARE THE TASKS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY?

It is clear that the problem of defending culture and of winning over the cultural movement as a strong and integral part of the democratic front is our special responsibility. This fundamental purpose can only be accomplished through the establishment of the unity, upon a progressive program, of the cultural movement itself and secondly upon the alliance of that movement with the developing democratic front. It is clear from the preceding discussion that the Federal Arts Bills are a central part of the program through which this can best be effected.

At the present time there exists a situation which is entirely favorable to the spreading of the campaign for the bills out among the broad masses of the working and middle classes in every section of the country. In Congress two highly successful hearings have been held during the present session on the question of permanent government sponsorship of the arts. In the Senate, a sub-committee of the Labor and Education Committee headed by Senator Pepper of Florida will probably report a bill before the termination of the session. The victory of Pepper in the Florida primaries is of great importance to this measure. In the House, the hearings conducted by a sub-committee of the Committee on Patents, chairmaned by Congressman Sirovich of New York, has already resulted in a favorable report of the bill described above. At the time of writing there is every expectation that the full committee will report this bill favorably to the entire House of Representatives.

We must mobilize the cultural organizations, the trade unions, the mass organizations and the unemployed, in support of this legislation. The needs and desires of the American people for an adequate cultural program must be made articulate through the raising of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this issue in every group in all sections of the country. A far-flung and intensive campaign of education and discussion should be instituted in preparation for the coming Congressional and local elections. *The Federal Arts Bills should be made an issue in every election struggle.* In every community where the Arts Projects of the W.P.A. are functioning, these projects should be defended from the special attacks leveled against them constantly by the reactionary press.

The campaign for the bill offers a splendid opportunity to defend these projects. Every effort must be made to extend and strengthen them with the particular view to increasing their ability to serve the public in each locality. The special cultural contributions and needs of the Negro people must be brought forward sharply and incorporated into the fabric of the campaign. The interests of the youth should be related to this program. Finally, we, as the most advanced section of the democratic front, must apply ourselves especially to the discovery and encouragement of the various indigenous cultures existing in our communities. We must see to it that the arts and the crafts of the American people, now practiced in obscurity and without encouragement throughout our country, are brought forward and made part of the conscious progressive heritage of the American people. The campaign for this program is an important step in the creation of a lasting coalition of the cultural movement with the rest of the progressive movement *on a widespread and national scale;* it can mark the beginning of the final defeat of the reactionary policy of economic and ideological isolation of the cultural movement from the masses of the American people. On the basis of this program, the arts can flourish as the allies of the people and the enemy of reaction.

In the words of Lenin:

"Art belongs to the people. It must let its roots go down deep into the very thick of the masses. It must unite the feeling, thought and will of these masses, uplift them. It must awaken the artists among them and develop them. Must we provide fine cakes for a small minority while the masses of workers and peasants still lack black bread? I mean this, it must be understood, not only in a direct sense, but also figuratively. We must always have the workers and peasants before our eyes. For their sake we must learn management, learn to count. This is also true for the field of art and culture."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WORLD COMMUNIST PRESS

THROUGHOUT CATALONIA—FORTIFIED LINES OF RESISTANCE

Editorial, *Frente Rojo*, Barcelona, April 20, 1938

RESISTANCE is not a static slogan. It is not simply an invocation to all to face the difficult days we are living through. Nor is it an heroic appeal for permanent passivity in the firing-line.

It is the policy of the Republic in defense of its seriously threatened liberty, and at the same time the certainty of being able some day soon to leap out of the trenches of resistance to attack successfully.

But, furthermore, the great national flag and slogan—*Resist! Resist!*—is not an order in the abstract. The people must be told how it can resist. And everything necessary must be done to achieve resistance.

The fundamental thing is to mobilize the entire people. This has already been begun, and it is urgent to quicken and strengthen the rhythm to attain adjustment of today's exigencies and responsibilities.

Resistance will become victory. The enemy will dash its ambition and its onrush to pieces against the Republican defense. It will waste its men and powder and demolish its hopes. Nailed within the territory it does not succeed in broadening, it will jump out in disordered retreat when our military reaction can encircle it with a vise-like grip.

We resist while augmenting the army, while creating reserves rapidly prepared for struggle, while relieving men so that they do not exhaust their morale in the vanguard but only their physical strength, thus making possible a good utilization of units, while exerting, in brief, every force to broaden and strengthen the fighters' ranks.

Everywhere the surpassing importance of this word must be learned: *Fortify!* If we do not fortify, no one, not even the most heroic fighters, can resist. Our guns destroy the enemy, but they can be fired with true aim only from fortified lines. The slogan is old, but it must be vigorously revived. And effectively. We cannot hand over to the soldiers the function of fortification builders, running into thousands, who must understand the enormous responsibility of their work and must not abandon it under any pretext, be what it may the danger threatening them. Mobilizing for this purpose, the trade unions must notify their members that the fortification builder —as much as the soldier—has his similar duties. Neither his own weakness nor enemy aviation among others are reasons for desertion.

All Catalonia fortified! Thousands of men ready to dig trenches, at the immediate disposition of the government. It is necessary, every time a military leader makes a request, that he immediately be sent brigades of for-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tification builders in whom enthusiasm, discipline, and perseverance in work guarantee exemplary labor.

Trenches in the Catalonia fields! Trenches in the Catalonian villages and cities! Trenches from the banks of the Ebro! Kilometers of trenches to serve as a refuge for us and as a tomb for the enemy!

We will resist to save ourselves and in order to conquer. This is the heroic policy of our fatherland. And its firm base must be founded in the cement and stone of our lines of resistance.

TOWARD A FURTHER RISE IN THE POLITICAL WORK OF THE PARTY

Pravda, Moscow, April 19, 1938

THE election of the leading Party bodies is an event of major political importance in the life of our Party as well as in the life of the entire country, because the toilers of the Soviet Union see in the Party of Lenin-Stalin the leader and the organizer of socialist victories, the seasoned vanguard of the entire, great Soviet people. Tremendous interest in the pre-election meetings is shown by non-Party workers and peasants, millions of non-Party Bolsheviks who are closely bound to the Party in the struggle for communism.

The Central Committee of the Party, led by Stalin, requests that elections of the leading Party bodies be carried out under the slogan of a further all-embracing advance in the political work of the Party. More than heretofore, the connections of Party bodies with the masses must be strengthened; more than ever the vigilance and activity of every Party member must grow, emphasizing the vanguard role of the Bolsheviks in production and social activities.

Party organizations are conducting pre-election meetings, not because they want to rest on laurels or to be content with victories already achieved. Complacency and concealment of rough spots in one's work are not the qualities of a true Bolshevik. Quite the contrary, a sharp and merciless criticism of one's own mistakes and shortcomings is a necessary condition for further advancement.

A new advance in the political work of the Party must accompany the elections of the leading Party bodies. The one cannot be separated from the other. Pre-election meetings are the media for the attainment of all possible betterment in the quality of the work of all links in our Party life.

The participation of Communists in the pre-election meetings must be distinguished by a high ideological quality. Attention must be centered on vigilance, on the struggle against the remnants of the Trotskyite-Bukharinite gang, on questions of the growth of Party ranks, on the ideological equipment of Communists, on work with sympathizers and the training and promotion of new cadres of active workers.

The present elections are distinguished by the high level of political activity and by the desire to discuss fully and exhaustively the work of Party committees. In the lower Party organizations of the Sovetsky district (Moscow), 40 per cent of those attending meetings participated in the discussions of reports. In twenty of the lower Party organizations of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Makeyevsky district (Donbas), 309 Communists took the floor in the pre-election meetings. The nature of the discussion indicates a greater activity on the part of rank-and-file Party members, and lively inner-Party work. At the L. M. Kaganovich Brake Plant in Moscow the speeches of Communists reared by the Party organization and promoted to leading economic and political work were a remarkable and living illustration of the development of cadres. There fifty comrades have been promoted to leading work at the plant; twenty comrades have been entrusted with responsible work outside the plant; and more than 100 have for the first time participated actively in agitational and propaganda work. The growth of new cadres is the most important achievement of the work of the Party nuclei at the plant.

Pre-election meetings afford tremendous political schooling for a Party member. Elections verify the militancy of every Bolshevik to whom the interests of our entire Party are dear and who actively contribute towards enlivening the Party and political work and raising it to a higher plane.

The vivid and varied Party life must find its reflection in the pre-election reports. The interests of the people, the training of Party members —these are the things on which the Party reports must be centered. Of course, a simple and mechanical enumeration of individuals promoted to responsible economic and political work does not satisfy Communists. Exactly such was the case at the Kharkov Hammer and Sickle Plant and at the Moscow Calibre Plant.

It is, of course, easier to clutter one's report abundantly with figures than to speak about concrete deeds and living people. In the reports of Party organizers who are not adequately connected with the masses, dry statistical expositions prevail. Such organizers speak of people as if they were machines. It is appropriate here to call to mind Comrade Stalin's words directed against a soulless, bureaucratic attitude toward workers. Comrade Stalin said:

> "People have learned how to value machinery and to make reports of how many machines we have in our mills and factories. But I do not know of one instance when a report was made with equal zest of the number of people we have developed in a given period, how we assisted people to grow and become tempered in their work." *

The Party and Comrade Stalin teach us and demand that organizers show solicitude toward the workers "big" and "small," that they rear them with care, that they help them when they need assistance, that they bring them forward. Pre-election meetings must be a stimulus towards the further promotion of Party cadres and toward a bold promotion of the tried and tested Stalinist youth to leadership in Party bodies.

Communists highly value those leaders who are men of their word, who can teach the masses and at the same time learn from the masses. The Party masses trust the Bolsheviks who are honest, thoroughly proved, and faithful to communism to the end, knowing that such Bolsheviks, tested in a merciless struggle against the enemies of the people, will achieve a

* Joseph Stalin, *The Soviets and the Individual*, p. 11, International Publishers, New York City.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

further advance in the political work of the Party. In the Krasnaya Presnya District Party organization (Moscow), 80 per cent of the secretaries and members of Party committees were re-elected. Both at the lamp production plant of the Moscow Kuibyshev Electric Combinat and at the Clara Zetkin factory the Bolsheviks re-elected their former secretaries of the Party committees—Comrades Ivanov and Himmelman—because these comrades understood how to respond to the voice of Bolsheviks. At the same time new forces are promoted to Party work—bold, determined Bolsheviks, men full of initiative, men who have no other life but that for the Party and the people.

In the light of the specific features of their work, the Party bodies in factories, plants, collective farms, offices and institutions of higher learning must find that central link through the grasping of which they will be enabled to achieve a general advance. All efforts of Party bodies must be directed toward the liquidation of the aftermath of wrecking, toward the eradication of the remnants of the enemy, toward the struggle for the fulfillment of the state plans. The degrees of fulfillment of these tasks will serve as a check on every organizer and every Communist in their active work, political maturity, and devotion to the Party.

The new Party committees and their leaders must be guided in their work by the proposals of Communists voiced at pre-election meetings. The leader who attentively hearkens to the voice of the Party masses will get a great deal that is valuable from the utterances of Party members. Concrete suggestions and wishes of Communists are a mandate, a collective will which the Party leader must make a reality, bearing in mind that the confidence of Bolsheviks is to be earned by deeds.

The great Party of Lenin-Stalin is mighty in its solidarity and unity of will and action, in the activity and devotion of the Party as a whole and of every individual Communist. The Party organizations are faced with great and responsible tasks. The political work of our Party is being filled with a new and rich content—the preparation for elections to the Supreme Soviets of Union and Autonomous Republics.

The Central Committee, led by Stalin, teaches Bolsheviks to be exacting of themselves and of others, to know how to multiply the forces of Bolsheviks by attracting to their side the broadest masses of non-Party workers, so as to fulfill with honor the greater political and economic tasks. The carrying out of the pre-election campaign in a Bolshevik manner will secure a new and further advance in all branches of the political work of the Party, will strengthen still more the ties between the Party and the masses of toilers.

PUT HIM OUT FOR THE COUNT

Daily Worker, London, May 4, 1938.

THERE is this about Chamberlain: he is in such a hurry with his pro-fascist policy that he never can keep any cat in the bag very long. Cats that were nicely tied up and hidden in the bag a month or two ago are out and scratching today.

For months and months this news-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

paper and the Communist Party have been giving the warning that Chamberlain's policy is a pro-fascist policy. At the last congress of the Communist Party a year ago it was pointed out that the chief fascist danger in this country was not from Mosley—the reserve weapon—but from Chamberlain.

Immediately a number of old gentlemen at Transport House—and other places, too, for that matter—stirred in their armchairs and muttered words to this effect: "How you Communists do stretch things. You really can't call our government pro-fascist, you know, it can't happen here," etc.

Only three weeks ago, when Chamberlain saw the Trades Union Congress on the arms question, he told those trade union leaders that he was really a "strong democrat at heart."

A lot of those people came back from that meeting and went about whispering to everyone they could find to listen that "You may not think so, but Chamberlain really does want these arms he talks about for the defense of democracy."

FROM THE HORSE'S MOUTH

And now Mr. Chamberlain has stood up in the House of Commons and told the world that the regime and form of government he really wholeheartedly admires are the regime and the government of Signor Mussolini.

"Today," he said, "there is a new Italy, an Italy which, under the stimulus of the personality of Signor Mussolini, is showing new vigor, in which there is apparent new vision, and new efficiency in administration, and in the measures which they are taking to improve the conditions of their people."

So there you have it—and you could hardly get it straighter from the horse's mouth than that.

Chamberlain not only allies himself with Mussolini against the Spanish democracy, he not only intrigues with Hitler against the democracies of France and Czechoslovakia, he *now publicly announces that he admires the internal regime of the fascist countries, seeing it as a model of the kind of thing he is after.*

In other words, Mr. Chamberlain publicly numbers among his enemies not only democracies abroad, but democracy here. He publicly announces his admiration for the regime which was the first to destroy democracy, destroy freedom, destroy trade unionism, destroy the cooperatives, destroy every genuine working class and liberal political organization in its territory.

THE THREAT IS OPEN AND CLEAR

The answer to it should be equally clear. It is clear to millions and millions of straight-thinking, hard-working people in Britain.

There are others to whom it does not seem to be so clear—yet. Labor leaders made a scene in the House during the debate in which Chamberlain made his speech in praise of fascism.

They made the scene because they complained that the Prime Minister showed "indifference" to them while they were speaking. They complained that he actually was carrying on a conversation with one of his own Tory supporters while they were talking at him.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To put it bluntly, he indicated he just did not give a damn what they said.

To put it equally bluntly: we are not surprised. He sees as he looks across the House men opposite him who are solemnly refusing to do the only thing that will enable them—and the millions of the British people—to defeat Chamberlain and defeat fascism.

He sees the leaders of a party whose headquarters still refuses the demand of the people for the great and victorious United Peace Alliance against Chamberlain.

Despite them, the people will make that United Peace Alliance. The people will insist upon unity against Chamberlain. And when that day comes, the only "indifference" we shall have to complain about from Mr. Chamberlain will be the sort of indifference a man has who has just gone down for the count to a knock-out blow.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Read More About

MARXISM-LENINISM

in Hundreds of Books, Pamphlets, Magazines for Sale at These Bookstores and Literature Distribution Centers

Aberdeen, Wash.: 115½ West Heron St.
Akron: 39 E. Market, Room 303
Baltimore: 501a N. Eutaw St.
Berkeley: 2475 Bancroft Way
Birmingham: 1907 N. 5th Ave.
Boston: 8 Beach Street
Butte: 119 Hamilton St.
Cambridge: 19 Dunster St.
Camden: 304 Federal Street
Chicago: 200 West Van Buren
1326 East 57th St.
Cincinnati: 540 Main St.
Cleveland: 1522 Prospect Ave.
Denver: 522 Mining Exchange Bldg
Des Moines: 218 Youngerman Bldg.
Detroit: 2610 Clifford St.
Duluth: 28 East First St.
Grand Rapids: 319 Bridge St.
Greensboro, N. C.:
315½ So. Elm St., Rm. 6
Hollywood: 652 N. Western Ave.
Indianapolis: Meridan Life Bldg., Room 401
Los Angeles: 226½ S. Spring St.
2411½ Brooklyn Avenue
Madison, Wisc.: 521 State St.
Milwaukee, Wisc.:
914 N. Plankinton Ave.
Minneapolis: 631 Third Ave., So.
Newark: 216 Halsey St.
New Haven: 38 High Street
New Orleans: 130 Chartres St.
New York: 50 East 13th St.
920 Prospect Ave., Bronx
365 Sutter Ave., Brooklyn
6th St., Boardwalk, Brighton
1309—44th St., Brooklyn
Oakland: 491 10th Street
Oklahoma City:
129½ W. Grand Ave.
Omaha: 301 Karbach Block
Paterson: 201 Market St.
Philadelphia: 104 So. 9th St.
Pittsburgh: 508 Court Place
Portland, Ore.:
323 S. W. Salmon St.
Providence: 335 Westminster St., Room 42
Racine: 205 State Street
Reading: 224 North Ninth Street
Richmond, Va.: 301 No. 1st St.
Sacramento: 1024 Sixth St.
St. Louis: 3520 Franklin Ave.
St. Paul: 26 E. 4th St.
Salt Lake City: 74 W. 1st. St. So.
San Diego: 635 E St.
San Francisco:
170 Golden Gate Ave.
1609 O'Farrell St.
121 Haight St.
15 Embarcadero
San Pedro: 244 W. Sixth St.
Santa Barbara:
208 W. Canon Perdido
Seattle: 713½ Pine St.
Spokane: 114 No. Bernard
Superior: 601 Tower Ave.
Tacoma: 1004 Tacoma Ave.
Toledo: 214 Michigan
Washington, D. C.: 509 G St.
Youngstown:
114 E. Federal St.

Write for a complete catalog to any of the above addresses or to

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS

On the INTERNATIONAL List

Life of Lenin

By P. KERZHENTSEV

A new, popular and authoritative biography by a veteran Soviet journalist and historian.

336 pages $1.75

The Communist International

By V. I. LENIN

Writings and speeches on the Third International. Volume X of the Selected Works of Lenin.

$2.00

Have you ordered your copies of these indispensable companion volumes?

THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

By EARL BROWDER $2.25

THE UNITED FRONT:

Problems of Working-Class Unity and the People's Front

By G. DIMITROFF $2.00

For Summer Reading—Coming Soon

THE SPIDER AND THE CLOCK
by S. FUNAROFF
Collected Poems of a Leading Proletarian Poet

THE WAY THINGS ARE
by ALBERT MALTZ
A book of stirring stories of the class struggle in the U. S.

•

Order from your bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED